THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

Fresno, California 93740-8014 Fax: 278-5745

Telephone: 278-2743 (EC-03)

October 3, 2022

Members present: Raymond Hall (Chair), Tinneke Van Camp (Vice Chair), Caroline Alvarez (ASI President), Rich DeJordy (At-Large), Kathleen Dyer (Universitywide), Xuanning Fu (Provost), Saúl Jiménez-Sandoval (President), Jennifer Miele (At-Large), Rebecca Raya-Fernandez (At-Large), Susan Schlievert (Statewide)

Members excused:

Guests: Venita Baker (Academic Senate), Maritere Lopez (Chair University Graduate Committee), David Low (Chair Personnel Committee), Bernadette Muscat (Dean of Undergraduate Studies), Jim Schmidtke (interim AVP Academic Affairs)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Hall at 3:00 pm.

1. Approval of the Agenda.

MSC

1. Approval of the Minutes 09.19.22.

MSC

1. Communications and Announcements.

Communications from the Provost:

The **Provost** mentioned that the Campus COVID-19 task force will meet this week to discuss new testing protocols.

There are also plans to get more guidelines on balancing in-person and online presence on campus, following suggestions from the post-COVID task force and other data to develop an evidence-based approach. This could include campuswide expectations as well as flexibility for different disciplines, for instance because some departments already had more online courses prior to the pandemic than other departments.

**Senator Dyer** mentioned that the post-COVID task force will be making recommendations to the Senate for policy changes that could impact spring 2024. By the time these recommendations are made, the fall 2023 courses will already be scheduled. Meanwhile, the Provost can make certain requirements for fall 2023.

**Provost Fu** added that he will be consulting with the Deans.

*Questions for the Provost:*

**Vice Chair Van Camp** wanted to know whether there will be COVID booster vaccination clinics on campus.

**Provost Fu** suggested to ask this question at the Campus COVID task force.

Communications from the President:

**President Jiménez-Sandoval** informed the committee that a doctoral program in public health has been approved for our campus. The CSU has also been allowed to explore more doctorates that are needed in the region, without having to partner with the UCs.

**Chair Hall** asked whether this concerns doctorates that are also offered by the UCs.

**President Jiménez-Sandoval** responded that it concerns doctorates that the UCs are not fulfilling in this region, and hence are not in competition with the UCs. We have a good regional need and, therefore, a good opportunity to offer doctorates.

**President Jiménez-Sandoval** finally mentioned that he will be visiting ten classes to see what is happening in the class room.

*No further questions for the President.*

 **Action Items**

1. Email dated September 27, 2022, from Terrance Tumey, Director of Athletics to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: Faculty Appointments to Search Committee – Deputy Director of Athletics. Email has been received.

**Chair Hall** asked whether this is new position or a replacement.

**President Jiménez-Sandoval** responded that it is a replacement.

Suggestion: call for service

1. Email dated September 28, 2022, from Jennifer A. Adame, Associate Professor in the Physical Therapy Department to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: Request Articles of Governance CHHS. Email has been received.

Chair Hall explained that APM 113 instructs that the executive committee needs to be consulted when a College or School changes their bylaws and constitution.

Suggestion: on agenda

1. Memo dated September 28, 2022, from David Low, Chair of the Personnel Committee to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: APM 338 – Policy on Office and Consultation Hours. Memo has been received.

Suggestion: on agenda

1. Email dated October 3, 2022, from Emily Roos, Executive Assistant to the Vice President for Advancement to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: Honorary Doctorate Nomination for 2022-2023. Email has been received.

Suggestion: Senators Miele, Raya-Fernandez, Schlievert and DeJordy volunteered to serve. If an additional person is needed, Chair Hall or Vice-Chair Van Camp would also be happy to serve.

Chair Hall made a motion to move agenda item 12 up the agenda, to become item 5, due to urgency.

Seconded

Approved

1. New Business.

None

1. WASC. Second Reading.

Chair Hall reminded the committee that this concerns the invitation from WASC to adopt the Thematic Pathway for Reaffirmation (TPR). A statement is required to WASC whether we want to do this.

He asked the committee whether this needs to be brought before the full Senate.

The committee agreed that that is not necessary.

*Chair Hall asked the committee whether we will accept WASC’s offer to use TPR.*

*The committee agreed with using TPR.*

*Approved.*

The President and Provost excused themselves from the meeting due to other engagements.

1. Graduate Program Review Policy Update Proposal. Second Reading. *(Dr. Maritere Lopez, 4:00p.m. time certain)*.

[Addressed after item 9 due to availability of Dr. Lopez]

No redlined version of the relevant policy was offered for discussion.

**Dr. Lopez** informed the committee that the University Graduate Committee (UGC) is concerned that they are out of the loop of the accreditation procedure following changes to the abbreviated program review process. She explained that graduate programs that are externally accredited can submit an abbreviated program review. This was introduced following complaints that a full review was very time consuming. Two years ago, the UGC was told by Dean Marshall that they would no longer be involved in the new abbreviated program review process. The UGC is not happy with that and have expressed several concerns regarding the new abbreviated process: it was not decided with Senate input and it takes faculty out of the program review cycle. The UGC do not want to overburden an already overburdened faculty. However, they want to make sure that the UGC is looped back in, rather than only receiving a letter of confirmation of re-accreditation. They want to have insight into the site visitors’ reports as well, for instance. The UGC would like an opportunity to offer feedback and concerns to programs that are not necessarily expressed by accreditation bodies.

**Dean Muscat** offered that for the overview of undergraduate programs, the Undergraduate Committee does not want to be a part of the abbreviated program review.

**Dr. Lopez** offered that the UGC asks other questions than accreditation bodies.

**Dean Muscat** mentioned that there seems to be more agreement with accrediting bodies in undergraduate studies. Past experiences demonstrated that oversight by the Undergraduate Committee was redundant. There is also GI 2025 data for undergraduate programs for the Dean of Undergraduate Studies to review, which is not something accrediting bodies look at. This is assessed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and this goes to the Dean and Department Chair, and then to the Provost. GI 2025 does not apply to graduate programs.

**Dr. Lopez** explained that there have been disagreements in graduate reviews. Based on this past experience, UGC wants the narrative and letter of accreditation for their review. The UGC does not get any materials before a program is accredited; they only get material for re-accreditation. She added that there is value in having a faculty committee retain oversight. An accreditation body’s concerns are not necessarily the UGC’s concerns.

**Chair Hall** mentioned that APM 220 is the policy concerning program review.

**Dean Muscat** offered that the abbreviated review is not in that policy. It was created in response to a Chancellor’s Office request. We were tasked with creating a process that reviewed programs before they went to an accrediting body, including five levels of internal review before being allowed to go to an accrediting body.

**Chair Hall** wanted to know whether this was communicated via an Executive Order.

**Dean Muscat** responded that this concerned a memo to the President from the Chancellor. This was presented to the Senate and other constituents, including all the Deans. It was agreed that it would be added to the APM.

**Senator Miele** mentioned that Dean Marshall presented the changes to the abbreviated program review to the Executive Committee in October 2020.

**Chair Hall** explained that the UGC can create policy, according to our bylaws. Hence there could be a discussion between AP&P and UGC to address this policy and there could be consultation with Dean Muscat and Dean Goto. The APM needs to reflect this new process. We need a redlined copy of the policy to look at and send to Senate. The Executive Committee does not write policy.

**Chair Hall** will send an email to Dean Goto about this discussion and about the need to have this fixed. He will also reach out to Dean Muscat and AP&P about the current procedure and where the policy needs to be modified.

1. APM 225 Teacher Education Policy. Second Reading.

**Senator Schlievert** talked to the Dean of Kremen and he prefers to keep the Teacher Education Subcommittee as per APM 225 and to amend the policy. There are many issues in education about credentialing, hence the need to maintain the policy with modifications.

**Chair Hall** wanted to know whether other Colleges and Schools, in addition to Kremen, would be impacted by this policy.

**Senator Dyer** mentioned that all Colleges and Schools will be impacted because all are invited to serve on the subcommittee.

**Senator Dyer** suggested to ask AP&P to explain this amended policy more.

**Senator DeJordy** wanted to know whether we can send the policy back to AP&P and ask them to consult with the Dean of Kremen.

**Senator Miele** responded that the memo says that the Dean of Kremen was consulted.

**Senator DeJordy** suggested to ask for a concept document from the Dean of Kremen.

**Senator Dyer** added that in light of workload equity issues, she is concerned about creating a new committee. This committee never met so it is like a new committee.

**Chair Hall** will convey these concerns and ask for a concept document from the Dean of Kremen.

**Senator Dyer** suggested to ask this from AP&P too. Their current memo does not sufficiently convey justification.

***Senator Dyer*** *made a motion to send APM 225 back to AP&P with a request for further justification.*

*Seconded*

*Approved.*

1. APM 125 Policy on Department Chairs.

**Dr. Low** explained that the Personnel Committee consulted with the Council of Chairs.

Changes were made in section C, for instance regarding what to do if no candidate receives half of all votes, or there is only one candidate and they do not receive half of all votes. The following was also added: the President needs to review the PAF of a nominee before making an appointment.

**Chair Hall** wanted to know whether PAF review is included in the new CBA.

**Dr. Schmidtke** responded that that is not the case. He also added that some issues are not reflected in PAFs, *e.g.* Title IX violations, so also Personnel needs to look at this.

**Senator Dyer** suggested to take out the comma after provost in C 4: ‘If a candidate receives 50% or more of the eligible votes, the candidate’s nomination shall be forwarded by OIE to the President, Provost, and Vice President for Academic Affairs’

Dr. Low accepted this as a friendly amendment.

*Change made: ‘If a candidate receives 50% or more of the eligible votes, the candidate’s nomination shall be forwarded by OIE to the President, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs’*

**Dr. Low** further explained changes in section E regarding evaluation of chairs after 2 years, which would be an informative review. This would not apply to interim chairs. Formal evaluation of chairs would take place in the first semester of their final year.

**Chair Hall** mentioned that using OIE to help with elections seems out of their scope.

**Dr. Low** responded that they were consulted and that they have the technology to do this.

**Dr. Schmidtke** added that OIE is more neutral than department DAs.

**Senator DeJordy** further offered that there are complicated weighing mechanism included, for which OIE needs information from Faculty Affairs, to allow weighing the votes.

**Dr. Schmidtke** responded that Faculty Affairs has been working with OIE and has been providing them the weightings and lists of eligible faculty.

***Chair Hall*** *made a motion to send this to the full Senate.*

*Seconded*

*Approved*

1. APM 322 Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness.

**Dr. Low** explained thatthis policy was confusing and now it reads more logically. He thanked the Student Ratings Subcommittee and the subcommittee’s chair Dyer for their suggestions.

**Senator Dyer** added that the Student Ratings Subcommittee created a new instrument and implemented it. This revealed problems in the APM. For instance, the old system was opt in, while Explorance includes everyone and needs people to opt out, hence a need to define what is an eligible course. For instance, regarding department chair authority, the old APM states that the College personnel committee decides on evaluations for part timers, but these committees do not look at part timers. Potentially more controversial are suggested changes regarding frequency, and procedure for administering student ratings in online classes. Response rates bottomed out during the COVID pandemic and they have not come back up. More than half of student ratings reports are not statistically reliable. We need to address what to do with low response rates. Personnel committees should have requirements about what to do to increase response rates. A low response rate should not be held against an instructor who is doing things to improve response rates, but personnel committees should be able to do something in response to faculty who are not doing anything to increase response rates. An option is to reduce the number of evaluations that is required and target people that need ratings for RTP purposes. Students now have 5 surveys to complete per semester, which might impact response rates.

**Chair Hall** added that RTP committees want to see progression in teaching ratings for an untenured faculty member across semesters and need to be able to see it.

**Dr. Schmidtke** wanted to know whether having students do less of these will cause logistical problems. Is it feasible? To reduce the burden for students, could we reduce the number of questions on the survey instead?

**Senator Dyer** responded that faculty will most likely not agree to a fixed set of questions, not allowing them to choose certain questions. She also mentioned that the instrument has been tested and that twelve items is considered to be reliable. Less items means less reliability.

**ASI President Alvarez** wanted to know what was meant in item 8 in the memo with ‘if they teach it for many years, student ratings tend to remain totally stable from semester-to-semester, not providing any additional useful information’.

**Senator Dyer** explained that this has to do with the observation that in the first few years that someone teaches a course, improvements are likely and ratings increase as a consequence, but less new information is coming from ratings after a few years of teaching the same course.

**Dr. Low** added that students need a feedback mechanism, and this is not only provided in student ratings. They can contact department chairs if there are issues they wish to disclose.

**Dr. Schmidtke** asked where the list of items to choose from in Explorance is published, for new faculty to access.

**Senator Dyer** responded that the list is available on the Student Ratings Subcommittee page.

1. Record Adjustment Committee. Second Reading.

**Chair Hall** will ask the chair of Academic Standards and Grading Committee to have someone from that committee be on the Record Adjustment Committee, which is a staff committee seeking faculty input.

**Senator Miele** offered that this might have an impact on the Academic Standards and Grading Committee’s charge. Adding sitting on the Record Adjustment Committee to the charge of the Academic Standards and Grading Committee might add some permanency to this.

**Chair Hall** will make a friendly request to AP&P to potentially have this charge inserted in the subcommittee’s charge.

-------------------------

The Senate Executive Committee adjourned at 4:50pm.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on October 17.
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