THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

Fresno, California 93740-8014 Fax: 278-5745

Telephone: 278-2743 (EC-06)

November 14, 2022

Members present: Raymond Hall (Chair), Tinneke Van Camp (Vice Chair), Rich DeJordy (At-Large), Kathleen Dyer (Universitywide), Xuanning Fu (Provost), Jennifer Miele (At-Large), Rebecca Raya-Fernandez (At-Large), Susan Schlievert (Statewide)

Members excused: Caroline Alvarez (ASI President), Saúl Jiménez-Sandoval (President)

Guests: Venita Baker (Academic Senate), Jim Schmidtke (interim AVP Academic Affairs), David Low (Chair Personnel Committee), Nichole Walsh (AP&P), Laura Yager (Registrar’s Office)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Hall at 3:03 pm.

1. Approval of the Agenda.

Chair Hall proposed to add an executive session to the agenda.

*Approval of the agenda as amended.*

*Seconded and carried.*

1. Approval of the Minutes 10.03.22.

Syntax corrections.

*Motion to approve the minutes as amended*

*Seconded*

*Carried*

1. Communications and Announcements.

Communications from the Provost:

**Provost Fu** thanked the post-COVID task force for their report and presentation in Senate. He is working on guidelines on course modality for fall 2023, and will be reviewing them with the Vice Provost and share them with Chair Hall later this week.

**Chair Hall** added he will share them with this committee for feedback, given that the post-COVID task force has ended.

**Provost Fu** mentioned that while enrollment is down, this year’s retention rate is higher. We are expecting some 500 new transfer students. This will be a big plus to our enrollment. The Provost added that he has been hearing from Deans that we have a lot of empty classes.

He further explained that he is considering setting up a faculty research support center, which would involve tutoring probationary and associate professors on academic writing and statistical modelling. He would like to have this start in spring, with brownbag lunch meetings and seminars. Through this center, senior faculty could, on a voluntary basis, offer help to junior faculty. He added that release time and travel would continue to be offered through the Provost research awards.

*Questions for the Provost:*

**Senator DeJordy** mentioned it was great to hear about the increased retention and wanted to know whether this applied across all years.

**Provost Fu** responded that this was only the case for first year students.

**Senator DeJordy** asked, since we are losing students later, do we help them reenroll?

**Provost Fu** responded that we have a retention center.

**Senator DeJordy** suggested, with regards to the faculty research support center initiative, that we also focus on qualitative analysis, not only on quantitative analysis, and that CFE can help develop those skills.

**Provost Fu** answered that quantitative modelling is particularly difficult and needs to be done right for publications. Senior faculty are a resource and can help probationary faculty get tenure.

**Senator Raya-Fernandez** inquired whether the decrease in enrollment affects certain colleges more than others, or whether this is happening across the campus. If it affects particular colleges more, we could evaluate how to improve enrollment there.

**Provost Fu** informed the committee that we are seeing a lower enrollment across the board but some departments have dropped more. He added that we are also, for instance, losing more female than male students.

**Senator Schlievert** asked why retention might have increased.

**Provost Fu** responded that engagement seems to be more important than academic performance to retain students. He added that students are, nonetheless, facing employment and financial challenges. There are also systemwide challenges, *e.g.* the 2019 immunization requirement. Some students could not register because of an immunization hold. Some 1,500 students had a hold because of not having provided their immunization information. This hold was lifted on our campus to enable registration.

**Senator Dyer** wanted to know whether these students had a hold placed because they were not immunized, or because they were immunized but record keeping was lacking.

**Provost Fu** responded that it seems that they were not immunized. He added that immunization information is processed by a third party.

**Senator Dyer** offered that an immunization requirement was implemented due to public health and now it seems that there will be some 1,500 students coming on campus that are not immunized and that could be problematic.

**Provost Fu** answered that the intention was to have them register for courses and then provide information about immunization after they registered but before classes start, and then to stop them if they do not immunize before coming to class. He added that there are no holds for this on other campuses either.

**Senator DeJordy** mentioned that access to records could be a problem in this regard.

**Provost Fu** repeated that records are managed by a third party, and he added that in many cases students do not respond to requests to provide immunization information even when they are unable to register.

**Chair Hall** added that some faculty are still concerned about COVID and wearing masks. Allowing unvaccinated individuals could be a problem.

**Provost Fu** responded that COVID is not included in the 2019 immunization requirement. The COVID mandate is a different policy.

**Vice Chair Van Camp** mentioned that it is difficult to enforce a vaccination mandate, as we experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Provost Fu** explained that it concerns a conditional lifting of the hold. Holds due to the immunization requirement are lifted now to enable registration but students have to provide proof of being vaccinated before coming to class. The COVID mandate was different and relied on self-attesting.

**Senator DeJordy** wanted to know, with regards to the faculty research support center initiative, whether volunteering senior faculty would get a course release for helping junior faculty.

**Provost Fu** responded that this could be considered, for instance for a few senior faculty. There could be stipends or professional development funds for a leader running this as well, one for qualitative and one for quantitative research support.

**Chair Hall** asked whether this would be run through CFE or IDEAS.

**Provost Fu** responded that we would use the infrastructure we already have.

**Chair Hall** wanted to know how many WTUs are being awarded per semester and per year now.

**Provost Fu** will get that information.

**Dr. Schmidtke** added that all new faculty get release time during their first two years, so that has to be taken into account when looking at those numbers.

**Action Items**

1. Memo from David Low, Chair of the Personnel Committee, to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: APM 327 – Policy on Promotion. Memo has been received.

Suggestion: on agenda

1. Email from Dr. Carolyn Coon, Interim Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management. Email has been received.

Suggestion: call for service

1. Memo from Dr. Nancy Nisbett, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: Federal Compliance Issue – Commenced Attendance. Memo has been received.

Suggestion: on agenda

1. Memo from David Low, Chair of the University Personnel Committee, to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: APM 301 – Policy and Procedures on the Appointment of Tenure-Track Faculty including the Award of Service Credit. Memo has been received.

Suggestion: on agenda today as item 7 (concerns new revisions after Senate sent it back to the Personnel Committee)

1. New Business.

None

1. Revisions to Kremen’s Articles of Governance.

This was already approved by the previous Senate Chair.

Approved by acclamation.

1. Priority/Early Registration: Need to define campus policy.

**Yager (Registrar’s Office)** explained that there is currently no campus policy on this, hence the need to create a new policy to solidify the process. The intention is to describe an equitable process across programs.

**Chair Hall** asked whether this would go under the 200 or 400 section of the APM.

**Senator Dyer** suggested that the 200 section would work since it includes the policy on adding and dropping classes.

**Yager** recommended it would be in the 400 section.

**Senator DeJordy** concurred and added that APM 405 concerns student records and APM 407 financial and institutional access. Access to registration is different from adding and dropping courses.

**Chair Hall** invited Yager to further explain what needs to be addressed in this new policy.

**Yager** explained that items would have to address what groups are mandated by law to have priority registration, which should be separate from what we have adopted as campus priority groups for early registration groups, and to address appointment dates. It should allow for reviewing approved campus priority groups every two or three years. Yager consulted with Dr. Nisbett (Chair Student Affairs Committee) about this.

**Dr. Walsh (AP&P)** offered that AP&P can assist, especially because this is a new policy.

**Chair Hall** agreed. He added that theStudent Affairs Committee does not have a charge to write policy. He proposed to pass this to AP&P to create a new policy in collaboration with the Student Affairs Committee.

**Senator Dyer** suggested that if the policy is more comprehensive than only naming groups that have priority, but also includes nuances for registration, it would fall under the 200 section. If not, it works in the 400 section.

**Chair Hall** will get input from AP&P and Dr. Nisbett.

**Senator DeJordy** suggested to consider using the incentive of priority registration to improve student ratings of instruction response rates.

**Chair Hall** referred to the fact that we are already placing holds on registration if students do not file documents in their ePortfolio as a stick. He cautioned to overusing registration as a stick and carrot.

1. APM 301

**Chair Hall** reminded the committee that the Senate voted to send this back to Personnel Committee and invited Dr. Low to explain how the Personnel Committee amended the policy.

**Dr. Low (Chair Personnel Committee)** explained that there is now an improved policy. See the memo provided, including amendments they agreed with and did not agree with and why, for instance regarding the use of ‘they’ as a gender-neutral pronoun. He added that there was a suggestion on housing documents, but this is beyond the scope of the Personnel Committee.

**Chair Hall** added that the latter is about a concern regarding the use of hyperlinks. He suggested that if a link name includes the name of the document that is being linked to, this is less problematic, even if the link appears to be broken; people can try and find the document.

**Dr. Low** agreed. Having links saves time. Dead links are frustrating, but when labeled properly, at least there is a breadcrumb trail to follow.

**Dr. Walsh** added that AP&P also had this discussion. There was a migration of our campus website that resulted in broken links. Dean Muscat has someone going through the APM to search for links that are broken so that they can be fixed. They are focusing this semester on the 100 section in the APM. It is better to fix links than to throw them out. AP&P wants the hyperlinks in policies. She added that AP&P is also in favor of using ‘they’ as the gender-neutral pronoun. The person working on finding dead links will check the use of pronouns in the APMs too.

**Dr. Low** added that the Personnel Committee reached out to the Cross Cultural and Gender Center. They provided external validation for using ‘they’ as gender neutral, in addition to the various committees agreeing on it.

**Senator DeJordy** mentioned that links sometimes go to old information. Hence, it is important to include dates and make links point to an internal search to a document instead of to the document.

**Chair Hall** asked whether storing policy documents is managed by Diane Volpp.

**Dr. Walsh** responded that that is the case, and that they are trying to make this management of documents more systematic.

**Senator DeJordy** suggested to be deliberate about adding dates. Checking for broken links is good, but we also need to check whether active links go to the most recent document.

**Chair Hall** proposed to get an update on this next semester and he will consult with Diane Volpp.

*Move to send APM 301 to the Senate floor.*

*Seconded*

*Carried*

1. APM 131 Procedures for Votes of Confidence.

**Dr. Schmidtke** explained that this concerns a change to the requirement for physical signatures. He added that there could be a form with signature software in place.

**Senator Dyer** asked why Dr. Schmidtke included a question in his memo and in the policy regarding including part-timers in this vote.

**Dr. Schmidtke** responded that it was suggested that somebody who teaches 12 units consistently, should have a vote.

**Chair Hall** offered that the Academic Assembly does not incorporate part-timers.

**Chair Hall** wanted to know whether it is a good idea to use OIE for this.

**Senator DeJordy** argued against using OIE due to the sensitive nature of this vote.

**Senator DeJordy** referred to A. under Procedure, which states that ‘Five or more full-time faculty members may call for a vote of confidence in an administrator by initiating a petition’. He cautioned that there might be programs or departments with less than five full-time faculty.

**Senator Miele** offered that the five faculty do not have to belong to the same program or department.

**Senator Dyer** added that department chairs are not administrators, so this policy concerns a vote on Deans, Associate Deans etc, hence the faculty initiating the petition can be from different departments and programs.

**Dr. Schmidtke** asked, if we would not use OIE, then who would do it?

**Senator DeJordy** suggested that the Senate Elections Committee could.

**Senator Miele** suggested to clean the document up a bit for Senate. For instance, put in the website and remove question marks and brackets used with the word ‘electronic’ that was added before petition.

**Senator Dyer** mentioned that the Procedure section refers to needing five or more faculty, but the ballot refers to 30 per cent of faculty.

**Dr. Schmidtke** explained that there are five faculty needed to initiate the petition, and then 30 per cent is needed for the petition to pass.

**Chair Hall** will make the edits.

*Move to send to the Senate*

*Seconded*

*Carried*

1. New Policy on Credit for Prior Learning Assessment.

**Dr. Walsh** explained that this concerns compliance with an Executive Order regarding providing credit for prior learning in relation to hours spent in the field. Other CSUs have already implemented it.

**Yager** added that this policy should include what could and could not be accepted. The aim is to allow flexibility for departments. A procedure will have to be created. The EO aims to allow students to get their degree faster.

**Dr. Walsh** further explained that prior learning cannot be double counted. When drafting the new policy, AP&P looked at catalogue language, and pulled from the EO as well as policies on other CSUs. The new policy also includes a provision on an appeals process. It will probably not concern a large of number of students applying for such credit.

**Chair Hall** wanted to know whether this requires creating a committee to deal with applications and what examples could be of field hours that could count.

**Dr. Walsh** suggested that we can use an existing committee. An example could be veteran nurses who have field hours. Requests can be supported by assessments or information from the student’s employer. Decisions would be made at a department level.

**Yager** added that our campus was already doing some of this, for instance by providing military credit.

[Provost Fu had to leave the meeting at this point.]

**Chair Hall** asked whether credit would be awarded at the discretion of the department chair and faculty members. He appreciated that credit for prior learning will be allowed but is not mandated.

**Yager** added that providing credit is highly recommended and possible, hence the use of the word ‘may', rather than forced.

**Dr. Walsh** agreed that there should be discretion at department and program level, and that this is discipline specific. It requires documentation and leg work from the student applying. It is about being inclusive and supportive for learning and experience. She added that the Chancellor’s Office deadline for this is fall 2023.

**Senator Miele** offered a cosmetic change: in section 3 B, it should say ‘see section D below’.

**Chair Hall** made the change in redline.

**Chair Hall** suggested that this new policy could go into the 200 section of the APM.

**Chair Hall** reminded the committee that this is a first reading item.

1. Executive session

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

The Senate Executive Committee adjourned at 5:00pm.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be held on Nov 28.
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