THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE (AS-8)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

5200 N. Barton Ave UL34

Fresno, California 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate

(559) 278-2743

October 30, 2023

Members excused: E. Mason, A. Mulhern, J. Pitts, R. Riar, H. Tae Kim

Members absent: J. Biggane, M. Hernandez, R. Klepper, J. Randles, R. Sias, B. Taylor, B. Yang

In-person attendance: 26 Zoom attendance: 25

The Academic Senate was called to order by **Chair Hall** at 4:03 p.m. in Library room 2206 and via Zoom video conferencing.

1. Approval of the Agenda.

*Motion to approve agenda*

*Second*

**Senator Bryant**: Move to table Item 6 - Resolution on Ombudsperson.

*Motion to amend agenda*

*Second*

**Senator Bryant**: We are in process of hiring AVP of Compliance. Restructuring of DHR and Title IX office is in progress. Not clear what reporting structure or funding of ombudsperson position is. List of ombudspersons at other campuses has errors and outdated information. Not all of those ombudspersons are for faculty.

*Vote on motion to amend agenda: approved*

*Vote on motion to approve amended agenda: approved*

1. Approval of the Minutes 10/16/23.

*Motion to approve minutes*

*Second*

**Senator Kensinger**: Change “reserve” to “preserve” on page 3.

*Vote to approve amended minutes: approved*

1. Communications and Announcements.

Communications from Provost Xuanning Fu and Interim Director of OIE Sergio LaPorta:

Interim Director of OIE Sergio LaPorta presented slides on enrollment and retention.

*Questions for Interim Director LaPorta:*

**Senator Ram**: Have we collected data on students not retained to find out why they left?

**S. LaPorta**: Of those who answered, the number one answer is economic hardship. Work and family responsibilities were named. Mental health was another reason.

**Senator Kensinger**: How are the targets set?

**S. LaPorta**: The Chancellor’s Office sets the target.

**Senator Kensinger**: How do they determine the targets?

**S. LaPorta**: We receive funding for target that Chancellor’s Office sets for us. Target is based on previous year. Growth in previous year allows us to request funds to continue growing.

**Senator Kensinger**: Increase in unit load might explain retention problems because students are taking on too much. We might not want to celebrate unit increase.

**S. LaPorta**: The rate increase per student is small. Average units might be 12.5

**Senator Chowdhury**: Not surprised about economic reasons, what I’m hearing from students is rising cost of living is a challenge. The university has an opportunity to help with that by providing lower cost housing. Any plans to expand student housing stock?

**S. LaPorta**: As someone coordinating strategic plan, that is part of the plan. Focus on increasing basic needs. 120 new beds are being added in the near future. There are efforts in the community that, if accepted, will result in more student housing.

**ASI President Carillo**: Have not gotten clear answer of how student housing will be more affordable. Experience with dorms is that it’s more expensive, includes required meal plan. It is more expensive than student living. Quality of housing is not good given the costs. The new housing will be better version of what we currently have, but how is it going to be affordable? How is it compared to Bulldog Village and other properties?

**S. LaPorta**: Do not have answer for that.

**Chair Hall**: That is a good question for the President.

**S. LaPorta**: Have not heard how it’s going to be affordable. It is a good point.

**Senator Kensinger**: How do we compare to retention rates at other CSUs, especially in the Valley?

**S. LaPorta**: Cannot speak to retention rates, but with enrollments we are doing great. We are fortunate that we have a local student base. 80 percent of students come from four county service area, 88 percent from Central Valley. We have a strong foundation. We are at the middle part of the top half compared to other campuses.

**Senator Jones**: How do you anticipate Bulldog Bound affecting this?

**S. LaPorta**: We don’t have projections, but our enrollment this year for first time students was excellent. Between Bulldog Bound and TSP, those will have a positive impact. Fresno State is a popular destination. Benefit of Bulldog Bound is reaching students who may not have gone to college.

**ASI President Carrillo**: Bulldog Bound is to get enrollment up, but what is the plan to make sure they stay enrolled?

**S. LaPorta**: Agree 100%. People want to come, but we need to make sure they stay for 4-6 years. It is a heavy lift for the campus, many issues to address including financial aid, housing, internships on campus, etc.

**Senator Ram**: Want to reinforce what colleagues have said and also want to hear more about these initiatives. With addition to housing costs, mental health, and workloads, we should survey students before they leave to identify other issues.

**S. LaPorta**: Already administer Before College Survey of Student Engagement to measure student expectations and feelings about college. Also administer National Survey of Student Engagement which tells us how current students are feeling and what they’re experiencing. We got extra modules for high impact practices and mental health.

**Senator Ram**: Do those address costs and housing?

**S. LaPorta**: I don’t know, that is a separate issue. But it is in the strategic plan.

**Senator Ram**: Is that spring survey sent to all students?

**S. LaPorta**: No, it is sent to Seniors. BCSSE sent to incoming students, NSSE sent to seniors.

**Senator Ram**: We should survey students who have not registered yet.

**S. LaPorta**: We reach out to those students in our college, response rates are very low. Some have holds or forgot.

Communications from Senator Bryant:

Speaking as chair of permanent position for head of OIE. Tomorrow is our first candidate’s open forum. The prompt for the presentation is to look at applicant enrollment, retention, and graduation data and make suggestions and recommendations. Senators invited to attend the open forum.

Communications from Senator Kensinger:

We are in grading season and we do not have a good plagiarism checker on this campus. Can either AI subcommittee or Provost’s office address this? TurnItIn does not catch a lot of plagiarism. We need access to a simple way to check plagiarism. Asking this question of Provost Fu.

**Chair Hall**: I sit on the Technology Steering Committee and will make sure CIO is informed.

1. New Business

*None*

1. APM 218 – New Policy on Credit for Prior Learning Assessment. Second reading.

**Senator Ram**: Change “reviewed” to “accepted” in Section II.B and Section II.A.1

*Motion to amend Section II.B and Section II.A.1 of APM 218*

*Second*

**Senator Shatz**: Bringing back discussion from last meeting about the purpose of this section. This is a section on definitions. With the challenge exam, what was being accepted was the exam itself. The confusion here is if it’s the outcome or the process that is being accepted. We don’t want to mandate that the prior learning be accepted, but want to make sure it is the framework for evaluating prior learning that is being accepted.

**Senator Pinzon-Perez**: I proposed two faculty members in the interest of equity.

**Senator Peterson**: All of this is about the definitions. The details should be in Section III. This is also true for the challenge exams. This is what Senator Shatz was saying.

**Senator Walsh**: As AP&P was doing the changes, we thought the same thing. There are more details on these items that should probably be in the next section. Agree with the wording, but would make a motion to move it into the next section.

**Senator Stillmaker**: Want to move to send it back to committee. There is a lot to edit that shouldn’t be done on the floor.

**Chair Hall**: We need to address current motion, and then can discuss whether language belongs there.

**Senator Ram**: I don’t think it’s a problem where it is, and if you move it out then you lose something about the definition.

**Senator Chowdhury**: What do we mean by “department or program”? Are we talking about chair, or department meeting? It could get unwieldy if it involves a lot of people.

**Chair Hall**: This language usually leaves it up to the department to interpret.

**Senator Shatz**: The difference between “is” and “must be” changes it from a description to an imperative. It goes from a description to a process. Speaking against the amendment.

*Vote on motion to amend Section II.B of APM 218: denied*

**Senator Walsh**: Motion to accept AP&P friendly amendments.

*Motion to accept friendly amendments that clarify of definitions and address formatting made by AP&P in APM 218*

*Second*

**Senator Kensinger**: Can we review the changes that were made?

**Senator Ram**: Motion to table until next meeting so that body has time to review changes. Most of my feedback submitted in advance was incorporated.

**Chair Hall**: Senator Walsh’s motion is still on the floor.

**Senator Walsh**: It might be better to give people time to go through them. Withdraw the motion.

**Senator Kensinger**: Unclear what the motion is.

**Chair Hall**: If it has been motioned and seconded, it is no longer friendly.

**Senator Kensinger**: The motion is to accept all of the AP&P changes?

**Chair Hall**: If we vote them down, the document comes back to the floor.

**Senator Holyoke**: You can ask unanimous consent to allow Senator Walsh to withdraw the motion.

**Chair Hall**: Propose to the body to allow Senator Walsh to withdraw the motion.

*Unanimous consent to withdraw the motion*

**Senator Ram**: To allow the body time to review these changes, motion to table changes to APM 218 until next meeting. In the meantime, AP&P can address unfinished changes.

*Motion to table APM 218*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to table APM 218: approved*

1. APM 327 - Policy on Promotion.

**D. Low**: Faculty have said that this policy is unclear on the process of promotion from associate to full professor. Personnel committee reviewed other policies on promotion and used those examples to clarify the process in APM 327.

**Senator Holyoke**: Is this a problem that needs a solution? This process imposes a work burden and requires personnel committees to develop new standards and review additional files. Have not heard that the lack of clarity is preventing people from getting promoted.

**D. Low**: As chair of personnel, I have been invited to speak with faculty who were approved by department personnel but denied at a higher level. There are faculty on campus who are not being recommended for promotion at some level of the process.

**Senator Kensinger**: Do they still get full? Being turned down does not prevent promotion if there is a grievance.

**D. Low**: We do not have anything in current policy that is grievable. There is nothing like a probationary plan, so there is no mechanism to file a grievance.

**Senator Holyoke**: Worried that five categories for standards will create confusion for how to define those categories. Is there a reason for 5 categories, versus less?

**D. Low**: This was taken from other examples. Departments will be responsible for defining the categories and what meets each standard. The standards determine being promoted at regular time versus early, for example.

**Senator Holyoke**: This could still be accomplished with less categories.

**D. Low**: It could work that way.

**Senator Bryant**: Concern that standards are created by department but approved by college and dean, and college personnel has to use different definitions for standards.

**D. Low**: It was important for college to weigh in so that one department doesn’t have drastically different standards from other departments.

**Senator Kensinger**: Concern is that this standardizes criteria for full professor, when current process recognizes individual faculty desires and strengths. Concerned that policy does not have adequate way to distinguish between associate professors who have significant service and cannot do research at the same level as others.

**D. Low**: Appreciate that comment and see the 5 levels of standards as a way to recognize that. These changes were in part motivated by those faculty who are too burned out on service to do research as other faculty do.

*The Academic Senate adjourned at 5:15p.m.*

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

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be November 6, 2023.
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