MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO 5240 N. Jackson Avenue, M/S UC 43
Fresno, California 93740-8023
Office of the Academic Senate Ext. 8-2743

April 1, 2009

Members Present: J. Constable (Acting Chair), N. Bengiamin,

J. Hironaka-Juteau, E. Junn, A. Parham, J. Parks.

Members Absent: J. Kus (excused), T. Wielicki (excused).

Visitors: M. Botwin, J. Waayers.

The meeting was called to order by Acting Chair J. Constable at 3:35 p.m. in the University Center # 203.

1. Minutes. MSC to approve the Minutes of 3/25/2009.

2. Agenda. MSC to approve the Agenda as distributed.

3. Communications and Announcements.

A CSU System report on student evaluations of teaching relevant to the current discussion of (APM 322) Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness was distributed to the Committee from the Statewide Academic Senate (Jacinta Amaral).

4. New Business.

There was none.

5. (APM 322) Policy on Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness.

The discussion by the committee on APM 322 focused on two primary issues. The first, although not the primary charge of the University Budget Committee (UBC), addressed validity of the proposed assessment protocols. Discussion on student evaluations centered on statistical reliability and the idea of re-inventing the wheel when external evaluation vehicles exist. A more vigorous debate revolved around peer evaluations. Concern in this area centered on bias by evaluators about those being evaluated thereby influencing evaluation reliability, lack of an appropriately vetted peer evaluation vehicle, and lack of suitable comparative measures among faculty, class types and colleges. The second focus of the discussion addressed the implied costs of implementing APM 322 as written. It was noted by the committee that there were numerous small costs written into the proposal that although not direct required time of faculty and/or staff to complete the evaluations. A wide-ranging debate addressing costs (direct and indirect) resulted in the following motion:

- MSC to reject the proposal as currently written due to costs associated with the following items:
- a. The University is required to provide "professional development opportunities", what opportunities, specifically, does this refer? What activities are deemed suitable as development opportunities? How are these opportunities to be funded?
- b. Concerns over workload required to implement the evaluations as written. Peer evaluations are costly with respect to faculty time and will likely limit time availability for scholarship. Time concerns also centered on student office worker time to check Scantrons.
- c. Department Chair tasks as outlined represent significant time input and involvement with key management decisions without appropriate compensation.
- d. Small departments may have insufficient personnel to meet the outlined requirements for all evaluation protocols. Are small departments permitted to bring in faculty from other departments to aid in their evaluations? If so what are the compensation mechanisms?
- e. There may be significant time costs associated with developing a reliable and vetted in-house system for performing student and peer evaluation. Using an external student evaluation system may prove a cost effective if it is possible to gain appropriate "teaching effectiveness" information.
- 6. Proposed Academic Year 09-10 Budget Cuts Open discussion.

Discussion of the AY 09-10 budget was postponed until the next UBC meeting.

MSC to adjourn at 5:10 p.m.

The next University Budget Committee meeting will be on Wednesday, April 15, 2009 at **3:30 p.m.** in the University Center #203.

Agenda.

- 1. Approval of the Minutes of April 1, 2009.
- 2. Approval of the Agenda.
- 3. Communications and Announcements.
- 4. New Business.
- 5. Proposed Academic Year 09-10 Budget Cuts Open discussion.