THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE (AS-19)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

5200 N. Barton Ave UL34

Fresno, California 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate

(559) 278-2743

April 15, 2024

Members excused: Maria Calahorra-Jimenez, Bee Yang, Emily Mason

Members absent: 0

In-person attendance:23 Zoom attendance: 39

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.

*Motion to approve agenda*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to approve agenda: approved*

1. Approval of the Minutes 03/18/2024.

*Motion to approve minutes*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to approve minutes: approved*

1. Communications and Announcements.

Communications from Senator Loretta Kensinger:

**Senator Kensinger** would like to congratulate Asian American Studies on honoring two faculty members and a wonderful evening event. **Senator Kensinger** also thanked **Provost Fu** for his comments at the event.

Communications from Chair Hall:

The Board of Trustees has voted to approve a unified GE pathway. A draft of the Executive Order will be included with Senate documents for feedback. April 22 is the deadline for providing feedback to Chancellor’s Office. Chair Hall also encourages faculty to nominate for search committees for AVP of Facilities Management and Deputy CIO. Nominations for Athletics Director search committee also still open.

Communications from Senator Aldea Mulhern:

Faculty in College of Arts and Humanities, College of Social Sciences, and Library have reported issues with being able to access PAF. The issue seems to be widespread.

1. New Business

*None*

1. APM 323 – Policy on Faculty Personnel Files.

**Senator Lopez** shared that faculty can access PAF but documents are missing.

**Senator Lopez motioned** to amend Section A to include language on what faculty can do if materials are missing from PAF.

*Motion to amend Section A of APM 323*

*Second*

**Senator Lopez** explained that this change will help faculty moving from physical portfolios to Interfolio.

**Senator Kensinger** complimented **Senator Lopez** on a well-written amendment.

**AVP Schmidtke** clarified the difference between WPAF and PAF. Items that are only in the WPAF return to the faculty and do not go in the PAF. PAF only includes items added by Dean’s office and are not on Interfolio.

**Senator Kensinger** expressed confusion because the APM is regarding the PAF and WPAF and suggested there be language on what to do if something is missing from WPAF.

**Senator Jones** noted that the language from Senator Lopez is appropriately placed in section on PAF.

**Chair Hall** requested that **Senator Mulhern** give more information on faculty saying they cannot access PAF.

**Senator Mulhern** recalls that at least one person was unable to access PAF, and other person received a mirror folder that was incomplete. **Senator Mulhern** suggested amending language to include situations where faculty believe something is missing but are unsure what is missing.

**Senator Lent** recalled situations where items that were supposed to be in PAF are missing, and faculty do not realize they are missing until they are in the middle of evaluation. **Senator Lent** believes this amendment is a good step, but also needs to be reflected in section on WPAF.

**CIO Johri** asked for clarification because there are two locations for PAF - Google Drive and local storage.

**AVP Schmidtke** believes that it differs from one college to another. This might need to be addressed, and is part of the reason why APM 323 is being updated.

**Senator Ram** agrees with **Senator Lent** that language is also needed for WPAF. **Senator Ram** believes faculty should get link to PAF prior to starting evaluation process. **AVP Schmidtke** responded that they are given the link and can review what is put in Interfolio.

**Senator Walsh** shared that when she went through evaluation, she found that documents were missing from peer reviews when she received the link to review her file.

**AVP Schmidtke** shared that the most common missing item is peer evaluations. Working to digitize process through Adobe Sign and reduce human error.

*Vote on motion to amend Section A of APM 323: approved*

**Senator Kensinger** recalled concerns expressed during last Senate meeting about access to a log of who has viewed documents when they are digital. Can faculty see a log of who has accessed their file?

**AVP Schmidtke** shared that they are considering moving PAFs to OnBase, which does keep a detailed access log, or create system of temporary and documented access.

**Chair Hall** noted that personnel committee has to initial when they access WPAF.

**CIO Johri** shared that there is a record of any access or changes to Google Drive, but it is not easily accessible to faculty. But faculty can request access log. **CIO Johri** would like for campus to decide on a single process for storing files, because right now it is not consistent across colleges.

**Chair Hall** asked **CIO Johri** what the safest place is to store confidential files. **CIO Johri** responded that Google Drive is now compliant and documents are secured. Google Drive is also the most sophisticated backup. Physical servers on campus have backup, but it is older technology. **CIO Johri** also shared that there is no policy on how long documents should be kept, so currently they are kept forever.

**AVP Schmidtke** clarified that there is a retention policy for PAFs, they are destroyed 10 years after employee goes inactive.

**Senator Wise** asked for clarification because APM 323 says 5 years.

**Senator Lopez** asked **CIO Johri** about access to Google Drive. **CIO Johri** responded that processes need to specify what happens to information after faculty are separated from access.

**Senator Lent** expressed concern about file integrity when transferring from one platform to another - are their checks for integrity and also authenticity of files?

**CIO Johri** responded that she is not familiar with the movement between Google Drive and Interfolio, so that needs to be a conversation. But once files are moved into Google Drive, we do not have technology to scan files and ensure integrity of the files.

**AVP Schmidtke** verified that the policy for removing PAFs is 10 years so APM needs to be updated.

*Friendly amendment accepted to change to ten years in A.18*

**Senator Jones** referenced deleted Section B.7 and asked what happens to WPAF material once it’s closed. Elimination of B.7 removes process to disassemble WPAF.

**AVP Schmidkte** responded that B.7 was relevant when we had physical WPAFs and that the cases continue to exist in Interfolio. Policy needs to clarify what is done to Interfolio after case is closed. Cases can still be viewed in Interfolio in perpetuity.

**Senator Mulhern** believes that the log of access to PAF is part of PAF according to Article 11 of CBA, which faculty has access to.

**AVP Schmidkte** believes dean’s assistants are still maintaining log of access to PAF.

**Chair Hall** stated that we will follow up to ensure this is happening.

**Senator Ram** raised question about Section D.2 and retention policy for part-time lecturer applications.

**CIO Johri** responded that she will check CSU policy.

**AVP Schmidtke** clarified that these are applications for part-time faculty positions, not necessarily those who were hired. The policy is to allow departments to retain materials from recent applicants so that they can return to the pool when new hires are needed.

**Senator Ram** asked if these field are retained by department chair or Faculty Affairs?

**AVP Schmidtke** confirmed that this is because Faculty Affairs was deleting applications and chairs were getting frustrated, so this allows application materials to be kept.

**Senator Ram** asked **AVP Schmidtke** how long application materials are actually kept if it says “up to” 3 years. **AVP Schmidtke** said that the language allows materials to be removed immediately, or kept depending on qualifications of applicants.

**Senator Wise** asked if faculty have the opportunity to download the PAF. **AVP Schmidtke** responded that they cannot be downloaded, only viewed. Faculty can have copies, but he needs to check with general counsel.

**Senator Bryant** asked how WPAF is different because you can download WPAF. **AVP Schmidtke** said you cannot download WPAF. Multiple senators responded that you can download the WPAF. **AVP Schmidkte** responded that you shouldn’t be able to do this. **CIO Johri** will check on this.

**Senator Mulhern** confirmed that Article 11 in CBA gives faculty the right to request copy of PAF. **Senator Mulhern** also expressed concern about security of files when AVP of Faculty Affairs and Dean’s office have access to the same file.

**CIO Johri** responded that access is tracked, so giving access to two people is not a concern for security.

**Senator Jones** stated that a process for tracking access would be helpful. **Senator Jones** asked what the HR policies and procedures are referenced in Section F.2.

**AVP Schmidtke** responded that it should be T&P policy.

*Friendly amendment accepted to clarify that Section F.2 references CSU record retention policies.*

**Senator Kensinger** would like to revisit adding language to WPAF about missing materials.

1. APM 399 – Policy on Emerita and Emeritus Status. Second Reading

**Senator Ram** expressed concern with Item I.4 and minimum time of service to earn status.

**Senator Kensinger** asked where language could be added.

**Senator Ram** responded that the language allows anybody referenced in items above to get status while being employee for less than ten years.

***Senator Wise*** *recognized* ***Betsy Hays****.*

**B. Hays** explained that item I.4 is to extend status to those who fall short of ten years but are deemed to earn status by faculty and President. **B. Hays** is open to adding minimum time.

**Senator Pitts** agrees **with B. Hays** and described situations where faculty have done notable service for longer than ten years, but not all at Fresno State.

**Senator Donnelly-Hermosillo** agreed that the phrasing needs to be improved because item I.4 undercuts item I.1.

**Senator Kensinger** is against item 4, because others have to serve 10 years and that is how status is earned.

**Senator Ram** motioned to remove item I.4.

*Motion to strike item I.4*

*Second*

**Senator Ram** suggested that footnote for exception can be added to item I.1

**Senator Holyoke** opposes this amendment because there should be exceptions for those who have put in less than ten years but have done significant service.

**Senator Chowdhury** referenced situation where somebody was offered honorary doctorate to those who contribute significant service but less than ten years.

**Senator Holyoke** suggested that the threshold be increased for faculty who can receive status while having less than ten years.

**Senator Lent** is against striking item I.4 because there needs to be something in place for extraordinary cases. It could be that item I.4 is reworded.

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

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

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be April 22, 2024.
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