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

October 4, 2018, 9:00 a.m.

**Members present**: Tamás Forgács, Rohan Jadhav, Jenna Kieckhaefer, James Marshall, Gitima Sharma, Anil Shrestha, Keith Story, Vang Vang, Wes Wise

**Members absent**: all present

(1) Approval of agenda (MSC).

(2) Approval of the minutes of 9/6/18 (MSC).

(3) Communications and Announcements

(a) Welcome of new members (Forgács). All members introduced themselves.

(b) Progress reports on the three ongoing projects (Forgács; Action letter for more support of junior faculty, rubric development of Sabbatical review, Letter to the Senate on reviving APM 328).

i. Action letter for more support of junior faculty: Gitima Sharma discussed that she and Rohan Jadhav discussed needing to go over the data, and Keith Story joined this effort. The three will meet to discuss action letter for more support of junior faculty.

ii. Rubric development of Sabbatical review: Jenna Kieckhaefer and Wes Wise need to get rubrics from College level personnel committees as a first step to developing a rubric.

iii. Letter to the Senate on reviving APM 328: Tamás Forgács, Anil Shrestha, and Vang Vang will undertake this effort. The group has a draft of the open letter, and the group reviewed it. The committee discussed that there is no element of research and/or publishing. One issue with this is that these tenured faculty members are potentially reviewing probationary persons, including their research, and the tenured professors aren’t up on the latest in the field. This could then become a rubber-stamping process or checklist, instead of how it is intended. One member brought up the other side of the argument, that after promotion an unspoken privilege that you can now focus on what you love and not have another probationary plan. You can’t just focus on one area however, it’s more of a teaching plus excelling in another area. There isn’t a punishment at this point, except more frequent reviews. A factor that may be contributing to the non-implementation of APM 328 is lack of personnel/time at the appropriate ranks. We could have ties to the ability to go up for sabbatical, being eligible for merit salary increases (if they are ever available) or other awards instead of a punishment. Research institutions have post-tenure reviews from persons in their field, and not from their own institutions.

(4) Discussion items

(a) CAIFE: Center/Clearinghouse for Undergraduate Research. How can our committee assist with this – goals, ideas, etc. (Forgács). $0 for undergraduate research moneys this year, this isn’t a part of this committee but could still potentially impact. This Clearinghouse could match students with faculty. Often times students happen across these opportunities if they have classes with certain professors, or if they find out there are openings in the lab. Another purpose for this Center is to connect interested students with faculty members. We could also have a publication process for undergraduate work.

(5) The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 am.