THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE (AS-11)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

5200 N. Barton Ave UL34

Fresno, California 93740-8014

Office of the Academic Senate
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November 27, 2023

Members excused: E. Mason, D. Lent

Members absent: A. Alexandrou, M. Hernandez, R. Klepper, L. Lachs, G. Newell, R. Sias, S. Tayeb, B. Taylor, J. Wakabayashi

In-person attendance: 23 Zoom attendance: 30

The Academic Senate was called to order by **Chair Hall** at 4:01 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 11/13/23.

*Motion to approve minutes*

*Second*

*Vote to approve minutes: approved*

1. Communications and Announcements.

**Chair Hall**: We will hold weekly meetings in Spring to get through the policy on the agenda.

**Senator Kensinger**: Why are we doing this? Are we on a time crunch?

**Chair Hall**: In EC we discussed setting a plan and identifying priority policies.

**Senator Kensinger**: Curious as to why this agenda is different. Asking directly to the executive board if there is anything that requires more time.

**Chair Hall**: Can’t provide you with an eloquent answer, but for example, the next item we will be discussing on associate to full has been in people’s minds for a long time, and it might be a bit of negotiation in this chamber. coming up is 206 which is regarding our online teaching and some post-COVID task force recommendations that speak to some pressing issues.

**Senator Kensinger**: To finish off my thought, not having a week in between doesn’t allow us to consult our colleagues about different ideas that are coming up in the Senate.

**Chair Hall**: We are not getting through these issues very quickly as of right now. The president has okayed our Academic Calendar. Some changes are in store for next Fall.

Communications from Dean Joy Goto

Dean Goto shared presentation slides on the external review

*Questions for Dean Goto:*

**Senator Pitts**: I haven't heard much about adjusting the workload for us professors. will we be reducing the workload as we shift to this R2 categorization, and when will this happen?

**Dean Goto**: This is what part of this peer review will look at. We’ll wait to hear what the results are.

**Senator Kensinger**: Are you seeing data in your report that we need to deal with course and teaching loads?

**Dean Goto**: There is qualitative data and three research taskforces subcommittee reports. not necessarily quantitative data. Don’t know if this will come out during the site visit.

**Senator Kensinger**: it would be helpful to look at other institutions' data to compare.

**Senator Pinzon-Perez**: I am the faculty associate in our college for justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion. how is your office ensuring to incorporate social justice, diversity, inclusion, and equity?

**Dean Goto**: It is on my mind. Seeing who is applying, and who are our PIs. We haven’t looked at that type of data before. But some PIs are looking at this, like the NSF Advance grant.

**Senator Wise**: Pertaining to one of the first slides, is there a way to break down that data by college and department?

**Dean Goto**: You can see that in the SARs on our website.

**Senator Stillmaker**: You showed the data of over 70 million dollars in awards. Carnegie is changing the classification to look at expenditures. do you happen to know what our expenditure is?

**Dean Goto**: Our expenditure for our Carnegie classification which is focused on the STEM areas was about 9 million for last year. The threshold is 7 million. If you look at the overall college expense is much greater than that.

**Senator Stillmaker**: We are not going to make the 50 million?

**Dean Goto**: I don't predict that at this point because that is a very high threshold.

**Chair Hall**: Will the databook be available for faculty to look at?

**Dean Goto**: I will talk with pour Provost and President to find out how we can communicate back.

**Chair Hall**: Do you know when we’ll have results?

**Dean Goto**: Hoping for early spring.

**Senator Jones**: Who will this data help? Is it meant to be communicated to external bodies, or will it be used internally?

**Dean Goto**: I think initially internally, we need to think about what this means for our campus.

1. Installation of New Senator.

Tinneke Van Camp was installed as Senator for Criminology

1. New Business

*None*

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

**Chair Hall**: The entire document is on the floor.

**Senator Ram**: Can I make a request to the committee to correct the footnotes? They all reference the EO but they are missing the letters.

**Chair Hall**: Myself, the Vice-Chair, and Senator Walsh will fix that.

**Senator Walsh**: Yes, I think we shifted them to numbers instead of letters but we should go back to the way it is on the EO.

**Senator Ram**: I want to suggest a friendly amendment to remove a comma.

**Chair Hall:** Friendly amendment accepted. Continue the discussion on section IV F.

**Senator Walsh**: This was a suggestion from a PDF request. This is in relation to the language that someone had requested. It was part of the comment in purple, and the suggestion was to make it its own letter.

**Chair Hall**: The chair is asking if we will accept the insertion of bullet point F under IV by acclamation.

**Senator Kensinger**: Point of clarification. Can you remind me what are we trying to do here?

**Chair Hall**: This is a suggestion of input.

**Senator Kensinger**: Does this language addition conflict with the language we have used in the previous sections?

**Senator Walsh**: I don't think so, this is specific for the ADT, and if they have that we honor those components as part of the associate’s degree.

**Senator Ram**: This is the exact language from Article 1, B, 3, b of EO 1036.

**Senator Wise**: Clarification on language don’t know if it’s a grammar problem because as of right now doesn't make sense grammatically.

**Senator Walsh**: I think we might consider adding the footnote to this article when we clean up the footnotes.

**Senator Ram**: One question. Are we referring to and referencing the correct section? It looks right actually.

**Chair Hall**: This is all of the edits.

**Senator Walsh**: Suggesting a friendly amendment. Under section D there is a double hyphen.

**Chair Hall:** We will make sure to check our grammar before sending it to the President. The whole document is on the floor. The proposal is to accept this as new policy

**Senator Kensinger**: Can we go back to section IV D. I’m wondering if there should be limits within a major for units within a major. Is my concern clear? Do we want it so that people can get most of their major credits done this way? Does this ever happen?

**Senator Bryant**: It says 25% of program units.

**Senator Kensinger**: Thank you for the clarification.

**Chair Hall**: Any further comments or concerns?

**Senator Chowdhury**: Is the section F that we just approved not contradicting section IV D?

**Chair Hall**: If there is a contradiction, unfortunately, that comes from the EO, which we can’t change.

**Senator Ram**: I think it is different. D is referring to examinations and challenge exams, not just transferred units.

**Chair Hall**: All these are works in progress and can always be brought up again for improvement. We are going to go ahead and vote on this.

*Vote on motion to approve APM 218: approved*

1. APM 327 - Policy on Promotion. Second reading.

**Chair Hall**: This whole document is on the floor for consideration.

Senator Holyoke: I have an amendment to suggest. The document as it came out of personnel had five categories. Department committees would have to come up with ways to meet these five categories which would amount to a lot of work. My suggestion is to reduce the five categories to three “inadequate,” “satisfactory,” and “exceptional.” To be promoted to full professor you have to be satisfactory in 2 and exceptional in 1, and for early promotion exceptional in all 3. Also, I want to suggest a friendly amendment on page 7 in the second purple paragraph, second line from the bottom, there is a “good” that needs to be changed to “satisfactory.” and the last visible line in this screen, the “good” also needs to be changed to “satisfactory.”

*Motion to amend APM 327*

*Second*

**Senator Roach**: Request to split amendments, one to change levels from 5 to 3, the other to change requirements for promotion to full and early promotion to full.

*Motion to split the question*

*Second*

**Senator Ram**: I don't know what the original language is. If we separate it then we would end up with language that is not consistent.

**Senator Roach**: My request is based on the change to have 2 satisfactory and 1 exceptional.

**Senator Ram**: If we vote no on that then it would say “very good” and “good.”

**Chair Hall**: Senator Ram’s concern is that we would have to add language to explain what “exceptional” means.

**Senator Kensinger**: Parliamentary question. Do we have to vote on the separation of questions?

**Chair Hall**: Yes, we can vote on it. Is there any further discussion?

*Vote on motion to split the question: approved*

**Senator Kensinger**: I want to speak in strong favor of this amendment because it matches what the policy is doing. The decision of “good enough” or not “good enough” is sufficient. Anything different will muddy up the waters. If we don’t do that, we risk handing this decision to administrators. This has to be a faculty-driven process.

**Senator Jones**: Is there a reason why it was changed to “satisfactory” from “adequate”?

**Senator Holyoke**: It was honestly personal preference. Something about adequate just didn’t feel right.

**Chair Hall**: We are going to be voting in the first half. changing from 5 categories to 3.

*Vote on motion to amend APM 327 to change rating levels from 5 to 3: approved*

**Chair Hall**: Let’s move on to the other component. Senator Roach, can you expand?

**Senator Roach**: I understand the initial thoughts but this is not something that is required to go up to associate. For me, this might not be necessary to go full.

**Chair Hall**: Do we have any other proposed language?

**Senator Roach**: To have satisfactory for all three areas for promotion to full. We can have a different discussion about early promotion.

**Chair Hall**: Your proposal is to put in “satisfactory” in all 3 areas? Do we have a second on that? Up to consideration is changing “exceptional” in 1 area to “satisfactory” in all areas.

**Senator Kensinger**: Point of clarification. I thought you had to be exceptional at teaching when you go up to promotion.

**Senator Bryant**: APM 327 does say that teaching needs to be excellent for promotion to associate.

**Senator Mulhern**: I want to speak in favor of this amendment. It is not exceptional to be an excellent teacher at our institution. It is not exceptional to be promoted on schedule. I think the idea of “exceptional” could go against what is the regular progression. I think it is reasonable to say “satisfactory” performance, which we claim is wonderful teaching, is really the standard for regular promotion in a timely manner. I would like to ask if Chair Hall could repeat the key issues we are voting on for those of us in Zoom.

**Chair Hall**: There are certain limitations to repeating things for those in Zoom. I will ask Senators to speak up, but that is as much as I will do.

**Senator Shatz**: I want to speak in favor of this amendment and echo what Senator Mulhern just said. I support the change from adequate. Satisfactory means you have satisfied the standards and the department set these standards. Excellent teaching is not the same as being exceptional. Being satisfactory means you comply with the means for promotion. I would strongly support changing this to “satisfactory” in all areas.

**Senator Holyoke**: I want to speak against the amendment. It is my impression that a promotion to full professor is not a right but something earned. Faculty should be outstanding in one area, and that is consistent with the notion of promotion to full professor.

**Chair Hall**: Satisfactory in all three areas is a yes vote.

**Senator Wise**: Just to clarify the comments, is the argument that we need to be exceptional in one of those three areas, or in teaching overall?

**Senator Kensinger**: I didn’t specify which area needs to be exceptional.

**Senator Holyoke**: Point of clarification. If Senator Roach’s amendment fails and mine stands, means that you have to be exceptional in any of the three areas. Does not specify any particular area.

**Senator Peterson**: I want to speak in favor. If we leave it satisfactory in all three areas, we no longer get to distinguish ourselves in the area that we focus on.

**Senator Ram**: I appreciate both arguments. I think is going to come down to how departments define these terms. Departments will decide what satisfactory means for each of them. Exceptional in one area will give departments the opportunity to set standards that prove that the person is prepared.

**Senator Van Camp**: When you have someone who is satisfactory in all three areas, and someone inadequate in one area, both won’t have the ability to be promoted to full?

**Senator Kensinger**: There is something qualitatively different about being a full professor. Associate professor allowed you to have your job and your tenure. You will keep your job, you will keep your vocation. If you’re happy with your life, there is no requirement to go up to full.

**Senator Shatz**: Want to clarify one of my concerns about keeping the exceptional is that we want to give departments control over the standards as they do the work of determining what satisfies promotion to full. it is counterproductive to tell departments to come up with measures for meeting satisfaction and still not be able to promote them.

**Senator Jones**: We do have a process in place to address no votes over disagreements of satisfaction.

**Senator Mulhern**: I think it's worth noting that what is adequate to promote to associate is not the same as adequate to promote to full. We have a higher expectation for one who is going from associate to full than one who is going from assistant to associate, because of the arc of a faculty’s member development. and given that we also need full professors to do certain forms of service and that we require professors to be full professors before they can become emeritus before retiring. it is worth considering that there is some kind of expectation that the performance of the duties that we understand as full professors and also the rights that one gets to serve in some service capacities and also receive emeritus status upon retirement and maintain access to the library are contingent on full professorship so full professorship should not be styled as exceptional, but rather as the fulfillment of the duties that are appropriate and satisfactory to a professor. I think I'm echoing the same point of the speaker who said that if you are satisfactory in all three areas that would equal the same thing as being unsatisfactory in all three areas. and that does seem like an inversion.

**Chair Hall**:  Emeritus policy is on our agenda.

**Senator Mehta**: Point of clarification. What is the scenario if someone is exceptional in one area and inadequate in the other two? Could that still mean being promoted to full professor?

**Chair Hall**: I don’t think that is what this means. I think it reads satisfactory in 2 and exceptional in 1.

**Senator Ram**: Should we think about this further? What if we just had two categories? I can appreciate some of the concerns raised. It all depends on what is indicated as the requirements, whether they are high or low. But by having “satisfactory” and “exceptional” as options and only required satisfactory feels like a much lower requirement, whereas just having two categories, you would expect a little more out of satisfactory as opposed to having three categories.

**Senator Holyoke**: Two responses to Senator Ram, we need to have the exceptional category. This requires a person who wants a promotion to be outstanding at something. The other explanation is that if we reduce to inadequate and satisfactory, how do we deal with deciding who gets early promotion to full professor?

**Chair Hall**: We are out of time. Thank you everyone for your input in this penultimate meeting.

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

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

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be December 4, 2023.
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