THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE (AS-06)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

5200 N. Barton Ave ML 34

Fresno, California 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate

(559) 278-2743

November 21, 2022

Members excused: K. Ciftci, R. DeJordy, H. Zengin-Bolatkale

Members absent: A. Alexandrou, L. Brillante, M. Calahorra-Jimenez, K. Coy, K. Fobear, H.T. Kim, J. Myers, K. Thompson

In-person attendance: 17 Zoom attendance: 35

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Hall at 4:02 p.m. in Library room 2206 and via Zoom video conferencing.

1. Approval of the Agenda.

*MSC*

1. Approval of the Minutes of 11/07/22.

**Senator Polegato** offered a correction for his intervention on WASC categorization of hybrid courses; he meant hybrid and HyFlex courses.

*Motion to approve the amended minutes*

*Motion seconded*

*Vote on the amended minutes: approved*

1. Communications and Announcements.

Communications from President Jiménez-Sandoval

**President Jiménez-Sandoval** informed the Senate that our campus was visited today by the Secretary of the California Department for Food and Agriculture. They toured the agriculture places on campus, but the President was intentional to place front and center what Fresno State does in all areas. He will be going to Washington, DC to do the same thing. Right now the focus is on agriculture, business and engineering, but the President wants to emphasize the work in all the disciplines. He invited Senators to reach out to him if there is anything they want to have highlighted.

Candidates for the VP for Student Affairs will be coming on campus. The aim is to name a new VP before the end of the semester.

He mentioned that Measure E (on the ballot during the midterm elections) likely failed.

The President will be attending about ten class sessions to know what is happening in the classroom. He emphasized that this is not an evaluation.

*Questions for the President:*

**Senator Jenkins** wanted to know how the emphasis on certain disciplines, in encounters with government officials, for instance, squares with all our students.

**President Jiménez-Sandoval** explained that we can be competitive in the aforementioned areas, but once attention is brought to these, focus can then be drawn onto other disciplines and to be more holistic.

**Senator Polegato** had a follow-up question about enrollment numbers, as discussed during the previous Senate meeting. It was mentioned that the loss of junior and senior students is due to multiple factors, including competition with the industry, and senators were asked to think about ways to reengage students. What are examples of such strategies?

**President Jiménez-Sandoval** mentioned that the enrollment data is being disaggregated at the moment. It seems that we have lost mostly women, and mostly juniors and seniors. More specifics will be presented in the last Senate meeting of the semester. Faculty are the boots on the ground and know the struggles that students are facing. If they have financial challenges, there are resources to attenuate these. But there might also be other issues. We want to know what is going on in order to retain students.

**Senator Moreman** added that we have been losing Black students at a higher rate as well. Are we measuring why they are leaving? He also asked to consider that strategies to retain students often focus on socialization and that those are not always the best strategies.

**President Jiménez-Sandoval** responded that proportionately more Black students have left. Less than 5 per cent of our students are Black students. He will ask OIE to do a presentation on enrollment numbers. We have followed up with students to ask why they are leaving. Dean Muscat has more insights on this.

**Dean Muscat** is working with Student Affairs to reach out to students who did not re-enroll to provide avenues to help them return. There were efforts in terms of removing holds for spring to encourage enrollment and timely graduation.

[Provost Fu could not attend the meeting.]

Communications from Chair Hall

**Chair Hall** reminded the Senate that we are seeking a new Vice Chair due to Vice Chair Van Camp leaving on sabbatical. The nomination form and signatures are due before December 2 and the election will take place during the Senate meeting on December 5. For questions, please contact Venita Baker and Chair Hall.

**Chair Hall** received a response from former President Castro to the resolution on retreat rights. Chair Hall mentioned that a resolution is not policy, but a position statement. If anyone feels we need to respond, we will need a new resolution. Castro’s response is in the Senate records.

**Senator Pinzón-Perez** responded that she was installed as a senator after this resolution was made. She met with Chair Hall because she had concerns about this resolution from the perspective of equity, fairness, and respect. She disagrees with the resolution, and argued that it is not the role of the Senate to tell another university what to do when hiring people. She emphasized that her heart is with the survivors, that there should not be any harassment, and that people should be protected. She added that the Castros have done a lot for the Central Valley and that it is fair to recognize their contributions.

1. New Business.

**Senator Pinzón-Perez** proposed to discuss the possibility of incorporating some of the items that she learned at an Equity Minded Pedagogy summer 2022 institute, at the Center for Faculty Excellence (CFE), into our university syllabus template.  This workshop, led by Dr. Natalie Munoz and Mr. William Hardaway from CFE, provided very useful syllabus items, adopted by other universities, that maximize equity, diversity, and inclusion.

**Chair Hall** invited her to send this request to the Executive Committee of the Senate.

1. APM 399 - Policy on Emerita and Emeritus Status.

**Senator Wise** recognized Professor Hays.

**Professor Hays** explained that a number of friendly amendments have been proposed since the last Senate meeting. Senator Wise and Professor Hays have incorporated these (highlighted in yellow in the document shared on screen during the meeting) in a new redlined version shared with the Vice Chair. These concern the following:

There is a new letter in section I.2.:

*‘(b) are exemplary part- or full-time lecturers; or’*

New language on who is eligible in section I.:

*‘4. Any other person as enumerated above who has rendered distinguished service to the University for a period less than 10 years, at the discretion of the President, and with approval of the appropriate department, be awarded emerit status.’*

New language to reflect the title in section III:

*‘2. For part- or full-time lecturers, the title shall be “Lecturer Emerit of (academic discipline)”’*

*These changes are accepted by Senator Wise as friendly amendments.*

**Chair Hall** wanted to know what privileges come with the emerit title.

**Professor Hays** referred to section IV. She added that the privileges included here mean a lot to people who have received them.

**Senator Maldonado** mentioned that all the titles in the policy now include the word ‘emerit’. Can people select ‘emeritus’ or ‘emerita’ for their title, instead of ‘emerit’?

**Professor Hays** responded that we wanted to make it neutral in the policy, and that people should be able to choose to use emeritus or emerita instead.

**Senator Jenkins** added that, from a quick Google search, it seems that ‘emerit’ is being advocated as a new title for emeritus and emerita.

**Senator Noël Smith** mentioned that there is a space missing between ‘name’ and ‘of’ in III.5.

*Corrected on the floor.*

**Senator Maldonado** returned to a previous point that it looks like we are in fact changing the name of the title in III in the policy to ‘emerit’.

**Senator Peterson** suggested that, while he supports this, there may be more changes to this effect that might be advocated for that will then bring us out of line again.

**Senator Mortimer** added that female awards are traditionally seen as lower, hence the need for a gender-neutral term.

**Senator Moreman** favors using gender-neutral terminology. He added that it is important for the Senate to take an official position on this.

**Senator Moreman** asked why we need a category for ‘any other person’, new item I.4. He fears it waters down the value of the emerit status.

**Professor Hays** explained that the intention was to keep the baseline at 10 years, but that the new category 4 under I., ‘any other person’, is to allow an excellent person who has been with us for, for instance, 9 years to be approved by a department for emerit status for their exemplary service. This would be at the discretion of the department, and departments can decide not to go below the 10 years requirement.

**Senator Jenkins** asked whether there are any provisions on revocation of emerit status.

**Interim AVP Schmidtke** responded that that is not included in the policy.

**Senator Jenkins** suggested to include conditions for keeping the emerit status.

**Dean Muscat** informed the Senate that, in consultation with AP&P and the Personnel Committee, her office is going through the APMs to scan for gendered pronouns and broken weblinks, in order to fix these.

**Senator Moreman** responded that the Senate should have a discussion about gender-neutral terms and using hyperlinks in policy. Policy is static and links can change.

**Senator Moreman** referred to section I.2(b). on exemplary part-time and full-time lecturers and asked what the equivalent is of tenure for a lecturer. Tenure is used as a measure of success for tenured faculty in I.2(a).

**Interim AVP Schmidtke** responded that after 6 years, lecturers go through a review and get a three-year contract, as opposed to a one-year contract prior to that. He added that emerit status is only exceptionally granted to Associate Professors.

**Senator Moreman** suggested to include something that is equivalent to tenure for lecturers in I.2(b).

**Chair Hall** suggested this could be when they receive a three-year contract.

**Interim AVP Schmidtke** suggested instead to set this at after the completion of the first three-year contract, so after 9 years.

**Vice Chair Van Camp** added that ‘are’ in *‘(b) are exemplary part- or full-time lecturers; or’*, should be replaced with ‘for’, in line with the other letters in I.2.

*Language added and correction in I.2(b): ‘for exemplary part- or full-time lecturers who have obtained a three-year contract’*

***Senator Roach*** *moved to waive second reading.*

*Seconded*

*Discussion on waiving second reading*

**Senator Moreman** spoke against waiving second reading to allow senators to read the amended policy in full.

**Senator Jenkins** also spoke against it because too many things need to be clarified first, for instance, whether the emerit status can be revoked.

**Senator Miele** also suggested to keep second reading to allow senators to bring it back to their department before voting on it.

*Vote on motion to waive second reading: denied*

**Senator Wise** wanted to return to the concern about revoking emerit status and recognized Professor Hays to respond to this.

**Professor Hays** suggested to add language that says that the status can be revoked for the same reasons that tenure can be revoked. Revoking tenure is in our policy.

**Senator Jenkins** argued that extensive changes are being proposed during this first reading, and that it should therefore be sent to a Senate committee.

***Senator Stillmaker****: move to send the policy to Senate Personnel Committee*

*Seconded*

*Discussion on sending this policy to the Senate Personnel Committee*

**Senator Wise** asked how soon this policy could be addressed in the committee.

**Chair Hall** responded that that depends on what is already on the committee’s docket.

*Vote on motion to send amended APM 399 to the Senate Personnel Committee: carried*

1. APM 330 – Policy on Market-Based Salary Increases.

**Chair of Personnel Committee Low** explained that changes were needed to align the policy with the new CBA. The Personnel Committee consulted with Interim AVP Schmidtke. For instance, the Dean-level review was removed because this is not required by the CBA. ‘Provost’ was replaced with ‘President or President’s designee (Provost)’ in alignment with the CBA.

**Senator Capeheart** suggested to include language in II.A) similar to what is provided regarding deadlines in RTP reviews, to prevent that there will not be a response:

*‘3. The President will issue, as part of the Faculty Affairs Calendar, the deadline dates for each step in the market-based salary increase application process’*

*Seconded.*

*Discussion on this amendment*

**Interim AVP Schmidtke** mentioned that reviews have been put on the Faculty Affairs calendar to address this issue. He added that Deans did not always know a request was permitted after a faculty member submitted one.

**Chair Hall** suggested for this provision to read ‘President or designee’.

*‘The President or designee will issue, as part of the Faculty Affairs Calendar, the deadline dates for each step in the market-based salary increase application process’*

**Senator Capeheart** appreciated that reviews are on the Faculty Affairs calendar but wanted to have this codified in the policy as well.

*Vote on the amendment: carried*

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

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

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be December 5, 2022.
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