THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

5200 N. Barton Ave ML 34

Fresno, California 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate FAX: 278-5745

TEL: 278-2743 (AS-11)

May 6, 2019

Members excused: L. Bryant, D. Cady, N. Chanda, F. Chen, N. Chowdhury, R. Raya-Fernandez, Tawfik, A.M., C. Yun

Members absent: P. Adams, T. Botts, C. Copher, P. De Walt, M. Ellis, K. McBee, J. Mullooly, G. Sandi-Diaz, B. Taylor, S. Teyarachakul, J. Watson

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Holyoke at 4:0x p.m. in HML 2206.

1. Approval of the agenda

MSC approving the agenda. Senator Alexandrou (Industrial Technology) proposed moving Item 9 to Item 7. The amendment and the agenda were passed without objection.

1. Approval of the Minutes of April 29, 2019

MSC approving the Minutes of April 29, 2019

1. Communications and announcements
   1. Provost Harper

The provost thanked the senate for their collaborative efforts during his tenure.

* 1. Chair Holyoke

Chair Holyoke announced that next academic year the campus will be moving toward an electronic RTP process.   
  
In addition, Chair Holyoke honored the outgoing vice chair and ASI president Wack for their service. Senator Kensinger was additionally recognized for her service to the Executive Committee.

1. Installation of new senator.

The following new senator was installed:   
  
David Lent

Department of Biology

1. Consent Calendar

A. Nominations/Appointments to the Nominating/Election Committee.

B. Nominations/Appointments to the Committee for Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED).

C. Nominations/Appointments to the Student Affairs Committee.  
  
No objections were raised and the consent calendar was deemed approved.

1. New Business.

There was no new business for the Academic Senate.

1. Cost of Student Ratings of Instruction.  
     
   Vice Provost Nef, Brian Cotham and Tom Siechert (Procurement) were introduced to discuss the item. Senator Alexandrou asked the guests how the new system would compare in cost to the system currently used by the campus.  
     
   Vice Provost Nef stated that the new system would have some associated personnel costs. Some support will be provided over the summer for a faculty member to help put the new system in place. However, no further information about specific costs could be provided due to state laws. Tom Siechert additionally stated that the system currently being considered is comparable in cost to what the current solution would likely cost going forward. However, those costs are all higher than those associated with what the current solution costs.   
     
   Senator Alexandrou asked how many courses are evaluated each year. Vice Provost Nef stated that there are roughly 200,000 individual student responses each year. Senator Kensinger (Women’s Studies) asked whether Mr. Siechert could discuss the facets of the vendor who is not being considered in the process. Mr. Siechert answered that the committee felt that one solution was not up to the campus requirements.   
     
   Senator Wilson (Computer Science) asked why the process is still taking so long. Mr. Siechert stated that the process simply takes time. Vice Provost Nef stated that the cost of the solution is one concern. Senator Ram (Universitywide) asked why the vendors being considered are so much more expensive than before. Mr. Siechert stated that it is possible that the current provider is underpricing their services, and also the new solution requires acquiring software licenses and similar costs.   
     
   President Wack (ASI) asked where the money for the solution might come from. Vice Provost Nef stated that Academic Affairs will foot the bill. Senator Henson (English) asked when the announcement of the vendor will be made. Vice Provost Nef stated that it would likely be during the current week.
2. APM 332 Policy on Range Elevation for Temporary Faculty. Personnel Committee.  
     
   Senator Kensinger (Women’s Studies) moved an amendment to the appendix to increase the length of the list of expectations for promotion. The motion was seconded. Senator Van Camp (Criminology) asked how many of these activities a lecturer must complete. Senator Kensinger stated that those numbers are elsewhere in the document.   
     
   Senator Botwin (Psychology) stated that few lecturers serve on university committees. Chair Holyoke clarified that there are lecturers in university-level leadership positions. Senator Alexandrou (Industrial Technology) argued that some of the bullets being added seem to be part of the lecturer’s overall job.  
     
   Senator Sullivan (Sociology) asked for clarification as to what “strong teaching and peer evaluations” means. Senator Scott (Communication) moved an amendment to clarify that evaluations must “meet or exceed departmental standards.” Senator Ram (Universitywide) asked whether this policy is intended to show faculty growth, or simply proficiency at the job. Senator Kensinger asked Chair Tsukimura (Personnel) to clarify the intention of the addendum section. Chair Tsukimura stated that the intention is to lay out exceptional criteria for promotion.   
     
   Senator Wakabayashi (Earth & Environmental Sciences) argued that requiring exceedingly good teaching evaluations could be difficult for a faculty member who is already good and has little room for improvement. Senator Scott stated that range elevation is not a promotion, but is a minimum 5% salary increase. Senator Kensinger replied that elevation does indeed reflect the quality of the faculty. Chair Tsukimura (Personnel) stated that a department’s standards are not a reflection of overall quality, but are a reflection of its minimum requirements. Senator Sanchez (Chicano and Latin American Studies) stated that the standards were set with a new system, and were therefore speculative. Senator Scott asked whether tenure-track faculty are expected to exceed the standard, or simply meet it. The motion was called to a vote (2 nays, 3 abstentions). The motion passed.   
     
   Senator Lewis (Kinesiology) commended Senator Kensinger for the amendment, but expressed concern over listing examples that might be inferred as a comprehensive list of things to do for range elevation. Senator Alexandrou moved to strike all bullets relating to instructional performance on the grounds that those activities are already included in a lecturer’s job requirements. Senator Cronin (Social Work Education) asked whether creative activities are included in a lecturer’s job requirements. That item was returned to the list and considered a friendly amendment. Senators Ram and Van Camp additionally moved a friendly amendment to return additional activities to the list.   
     
   Senator Henson spoke against the amendment on the grounds that teaching should be taken into consideration when range elevation is concerned. Chair Tsukimura (Personnel) stated that the section in question is an appendix, and teaching is mentioned in other sections of the document. Senator Wakabayashi stated that his department would like the addition of those criteria for use in range elevations. Senator Ram argued that teaching activities could be listed in both the main document and the appendix. Senator Parra (Accountancy) argued that the document is designed to provide guidance to faculty and should therefore include a number of criteria for range elevation. Senator Alexandrou stated that many of those bullet points are listed elsewhere in the document and are not exhaustive. The motion was called to a vote (8 ayes, 19 nays, 10 abstentions). The motion failed.   
     
   Senator Kensinger clarified that APM 325 provides guidance on the teaching quality required for tenure. Senator Lent (Biology) stated that tenure track faculty are required to both meet and exceed departmental requirements. Senator Miele (Finance & Business Law) reminded senators that lecturers are not tenure-track faculty, and anyone considered for a range elevation will have worked at the university for five years, with the additional requirements being listed in this document. Senator Alexandrou also clarified that lecturers also receive regular salary increases, as do other faculty.   
     
   The motion was called to a vote (3 nays, 14 abstentions).   
     
   Senator Kensinger moved an amendment to eliminate the tables in the middle of the document and replace the criteria stated with a section listing the requirements and combining the boxes into one. The motion was seconded. Senator Scott (Communication) moved and amendment to eliminate the specific examples on bullets 3 and 4. The motion was seconded.   
     
   Chair Tsukimura (Personnel) stated that the committee added specific numbers to those sections to give committees clarification on what the specific and quantifiable criteria for advancement would be. Senator Parra asked whether only one criteria could be enough to justify promotion. Chair Tsukimura stated that these standards are applied over a five-year period. Senator Cronin stated that even if the sections were cut, the previous sentences are still plural and imply faculty must do multiple things. Senator Ram spoke in favor of the motion and stated that counting these criteria is not necessary. Senator Lewis spoke in favor of voting on the item in the following semester.

The Academic Senate adjourned at 5:18 p.m. The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be in the Fall 2019 semester.
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