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-3)

October 2, 2023

Members present: Raymond Hall (Chair), Amber Crowell (Vice Chair), Jennifer Miele (At-Large), Rebecca Raya-Fernandez (At-Large), Susan Schlievert (Statewide), Lisa Bryant (At-Large), Xuanning Fu (Provost), Aaron Stillmaker (University-wide), Jim Schmidtke (AVP of Faculty Affairs), Karen Carillo (ASI rep)

Members excused: Saúl Jiménez-Sandoval (President)

Guests: Venita Baker (Academic Senate), Kelly Russell (AVP of Student Financial Resources), Nancy Nisbett (Chair of Student Affairs Committee), Nicole Walsh (Chair of Academic Policy and Planning Committee), Bernadette Muscat (Dean of Undergraduate Studies)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Hall at 3:02 pm.

1. Approval of the Agenda.

*Motion to approve amended agenda*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to approve amended agenda: approved*

1. Approval of the Minutes of 9.18.23.

*Motion to approve minutes*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to approve minutes: approved*

1. Communications and Announcements.

Communication from Provost:

*None*

**Action Items**

1. Memo dated September 21, 2023 from Bao Johri, Vice President for Information Technology and CIO to Raymond Hall, Chair of the Academic Senate re: Additional Faculty Representation for Technology Steering Committee. Memo has been received.

Suggestion: Send out call for service

1. New Business.

*None*

1. Academic Calendar Proposal 2024-25 and 2025-26. Second Reading.

**Dean Muscat**: Worked with Alejandra de Alma in Undergraduate Studies who looked at different calendars across the system. Received options from Alejandra, I will send them out for EC to look at. Alejandra also charted out comparisons re: holidays, consultation days, etc. EC should come up with one or two that we like best to present to Senate. Early November deadline.

*Executive Committee will review calendar options*

1. APM 232 & 400s, 500, 600s – Cosmetic Edits (Consent Agenda Edit Request).

**N. Walsh**: Fixed broken website links and changed pronouns.

**Chair Hall**: Propose to send these to the consent calendar.

*Motion to send to consent calendar*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to send to consent calendar: approved*

1. APM 320 Designated Position Name Change and Request for Faculty Representatives.

**J. Miele**: What purpose will this administrator serve? How will it help?

**Chair Hall**: We could ask somebody to give a presentation on this if we would like to know more about what the position entails.

**L. Bryant**: This is kind of ridiculous. We’re getting a new AVP of Compliance, replacing Jamie’s position, Jamie is being moved to another position. But this position is still under Debbie Astone.

**Chair Hall**: I will reach out to get an overview of what this position will be doing and what’s being done here. We can still send this to make sure it is under APM 320 and faculty need to be involved. Motion to send to consent calendar?

*Motion to send to consent calendar*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to send to consent calendar: approved*

1. Craig School of Business Articles of Governance.

*Motion to approve CSB Articles of Governance*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to approve CSB Articles of Governance: approved*

1. Federal Compliance Issue – Commenced Attendance

**K. Russell**: Federal requirement: When we pay a student financial aid, we have a way of knowing that they have started commenced attendance. This comes down to students who got WU or stopped attending, this is how we know that they attended in the first place.

**Chair Hall**: How long have we been out of compliance?

**K. Russell**: Always

**Chair Hall**: How long has this been a requirement?

**K. Russell**: Always. We have never had a program review. Some CSUs have been caught in program review and have had to pay money for being out of compliance. Adding last day of attendance to WU is part of complying with this requirement.

**N. Nisbett**: Kelly brought this to us last year. The committee sent our concern to executive committee. We had a task force that Kelly formed with faculty and student affairs and financial aid and advancement staff and students to look at the issue. Looked at what UC Davis is doing because they are a good model for how to do it here. What we’ve come down to is that this is not a faculty issue. It is a compliance issue like training requirements. What UC Davis has done is through student portal, at beginning of each semester the student has to acknowledge through student portal the code of conduct. Student would not be dropped from class for not acknowledging it, it won’t affect their grade, they will not lose financial aid. We don’t think this needs to go forward through Senate, this is seen as on the Student Affairs side of things.

**K. Russell**: Considered making it part of syllabus but decided that’s not the way to go. Communication will go to students and faculty, so that faculty are aware and can answer student questions.

**N. Nisbett**: Discussed faculty training, but UC Davis does not have a policy on this and it’s not on their syllabi. They treat it as a separate issue.

**Chair Hall**: Does this have to happen for every class?

**K. Russell**: Every class.

**Chair Hall**: So the student has to sign the code of conduct for every class?

**K. Russell**: No, signing it once will certify all classes. Only get it multiple times if they add a class later. Communications will all be handled through Student Affairs.

**Chair Hall**: This is through PeopleSoft?

**K. Russell**: Yes, and IT staff are aware that it is coming.

**R. Raya-Fernandez**: Is there something that indicates it’s required?

**K. Russell**: It will be a scenario where if they don’t, they could lose their financial aid. It will explain why they are doing it.

**L. Bryant**: I don’t think you need to involve faculty. Faculty don’t have anything to do with financial aid or student portals in PeopleSoft. I could see it if you need faculty confirmation that they attended class, but that could be done the way that Athletics does, and a form or email could be sent to the faculty. I don’t know why faculty have to be trained on this.

**K. Russell**: I don’t know about the training part. Department of Education signed off on UC Davis process, which is why we adopted their process. It shows up as an assignment, so that’s why we would do some initial communication to faculty.

**R. Raya-Fernandez**: By informing the faculty, it does put a higher level of importance so that they are aware of the significance of it.

**K. Russell**: Yes, because 80% or so of students get some kind of federal aid. But we’re proposing to send it to all students. UC Davis reported that very few lost their financial aid.

**J. Miele**: It looks like an elegant solution, so thank you for putting this together.

**Chair Hall**: This will not be pursued as a policy. We will accept this as information.

1. APM 233 Accuracy Updates, 5.12.23 (Consent Agenda Edit Request).

**N. Walsh**: Changing so that it reflects the way it has always been done, goes to course department, not major department. It makes sense to us because where the course lives is where it needs to happen.

**Chair Hall**: Do not see it is necessary to have Senate discussion. Put it on agenda two weeks from now.

**Vice Chair Crowell**: If people want to pull it from the consent calendar, they can.

*Motion to send APM 233 updates to consent calendar*

*Second*

*Vote on motion: approved*

1. APM 510 – Research Misconduct (Honor Code) Updates and Revisions.

**L. Bryant**: Is there a list of deceptive conferences or journals?

**N. Walsh**: The library would be responsible for maintaining that. We want to make sure there is a level of checks and balances, some journals were deceptive but then new editors take over. There is concern that we’re not taking care to understand the disciplines, so that’s what the library would do. But that is outside of this policy, and we have 505 coming forward. We wanted to make sure 510 is in alignment.

**L. Bryant**: Would it be appropriate to request that the library maintain the list be in this policy?

**N. Walsh**: It does say that.

**Chair Hall**: We have the ability to modify it before it gets sent to the Senate.

**N. Walsh**: We can change the language from guidance from the library to something else.

**L. Bryant**: I feel like it would be helpful for faculty to have a list to look at, some document.

**N. Walsh**: What we know is that the idea is being worked on.

**Chair Hall**: This is a first reading, so during second reading proposals can be made to change the language.

**A. Stillmaker**: We need to be careful to make sure we don’t make it a public list, because some don’t like being called predatory journals.

**AVP Schmidtke**: This is something that can be done at the department level, or college level. My concern is having at the university level a centralized list, it won’t be updated regularly. And people aren’t going to know who updates it.

**N. Walsh**: Look at APM and stale policy. That’s why we left language about library guidance. And we’ve heard of journals suing over these lists because they’re trying to clean up and don’t like that they’re on these lists.

**Chair Hall**: Research committees tend to be the gatekeepers, might be the right people to engage in this. Faculty can propose to get a journal added. Not sure what that workload would look like.

**N. Walsh**: We used to have that in Kremen, and those forms became obsolete.

**Chair Hall**: Maybe personnel committee.

**Vice Chair Crowell**: Department personnel?

**Chair Hall**: Both I think.

**J. Miele**: It is something that our research committee helps take care of. We decide what would count, instead of what doesn’t count. If something doesn’t meet that definition, we have a procedure that faculty can follow to have it vetted and approved.

**Vice Chair** **Crowell**: That makes more sense than having the library primarily responsible for this.

**N. Walsh**: Library can provide guidance. Leave it so that they can have consultation between department and library.

**Chair Hall**: You mentioned that there was consultation with Personnel?

**N. Walsh**: Yes, because we were working with 300s policy.

**Chair Hall**: Do we send this to personnel?

**N. Walsh**: They have already seen it. This version has been in consultation with Personnel. We were being careful to have loose language.

**Chair Hall**: Tight language will make it easier for Senate to process.

**N. Walsh**: I think the idea of consulting the library but maintaining process at department and school levels makes sense.

Adjourned: 3:42 PM