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)

January 29, 2018

Members excused: N. Akhavan, C. Guerra, D. Lewis, J. Mullooly, M.
                        Schettler, J. Smith-Warshaw, A.M. Tawfik, G.
                        Thatcher, E. Waldman, W. Wu

Members absent: P. Adams, B. DerMugrdechian, M. Golden, R.
                        Maldonado, K. Mcbee, J. Wenger, B. Zante (ASI)

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Holyoke at 4:03pm in HML
2206.

1.)   Approval of the agenda

      MSC approving the agenda

2.)   Approval of the Minutes of January 22, 2018.

      Senator Van Camp (Criminology) amended Page 10 of the Minutes to
      reflect her intention to ask whether cross-campus comparison of student
      evaluations would be "necessary" if the campus chose an internal option.
      Friendly amendment was accepted.

      Senator Bryant (University-wide) amended Page 10 of the Minutes to
      correct a misspelling of her name. Friendly amendment was accepted.

      MSC approving the Minutes.

3.)   Communications and announcements

            a. Provost Zelezny

The Provost had no communications, but stated that she was looking forward to the Senate's forthcoming discussion.

b. Senator Schlievert (State-wide)

Senator Schlievert updated Senators on the most recent meeting of the statewide Academic Senate. The Statewide Executive Committee has been meeting with the Chancellor's Office about shared governance and optimism was expressed by representatives of both sides. Meetings were seen as generally positive. Methods of measuring student success were discussed.

There were also multiple conversations about pending legislation in Sacramento. The Chancellor discussed the proposed budget and the fact that it will cover only one half the rate of inflation in California. The student representative stated that voter registration will be an area of focus. The CSU will have a $171 million shortfall, and even if some initiatives and maintenance were delayed there would still be a $61 million shortfall.

c. Senator Kensinger (Women's Studies)

Senator Kensinger asked the Senate to observe a moment of silence to commemorate and honor Elizabeth Ness Nelson, sociology professor emerita and former chair of the department who helped develop Department of Women's Studies and Gerontology.

The senate observed a moment of silence.

Senator Kensinger asked Senators to also reflect on the passing of Ursula K. Le Guin, a significant important feminist author, essayist and public intellectual.

Commented [BH1]: Friendly amendment from Senator Jones (Communication)

d. Senator Raheem (Counselor Education and Rehabilitation)

Senator Raheem asked senators asked faculty to take a careful look at students for emerging mental health issues.

The senator reminded the Senate that suicide remains a rampant issue among young people.

4.) New business

There was no new business for the Senate.

5.) Consideration of student evaluations

The Provost updated the Senate on the status of the current IDEA agreement, which expires July 31, 2018. IDEA has indicated it would allow a one-year contract. Current cost of the contract is $57,326 and the new contract would be at same rate. IDEA has offered continuation of paper option, or online option, or both. This would provide faculty with an opportunity to consider future options in more depth. The Provost also reported it would take 6-8 weeks for the campus Request for Proposals (RFP) process to take place.

Senator Sanchez (Chicano and Latin American Studies) asked for clarification about exact end date of the IDEA contract.

The Provost clarified that the contract ends at the end of the academic year. The current contract has been extended on an annual basis since 2013 and IDEA would like to move forward by establishing a multi-year contract with the campus. If an online option were pursued there would be additional cost to integrate new digital technology with existing campus IT systems, but this would be a one-time cost.

Senator Ram (University-wide) asked how long would the RFP process would take.

Vice President Adishian-Astone (Vice President for Administration and Associate Vice President for Auxiliary Services) clarified that it would take approximately 6-8 weeks for RFP to be issued and reviewed. She added that it would be good from a procurement standpoint to establish a multi-year agreement.

Senator Ram (University-wide) asked how long the previous contract had originally run.

Vice President Adishian-Astone stated that it had originally been set up to run for three years with the option to renew in additional one-year increments.

Senator Ram inquired about the exact cost for IDEA to provide an online option versus a paper option.

The Provost clarified that the cost would be the same for either option.

Senator Raheem (Counselor Education and Rehabilitation) asked about accessibility issues for students with special needs, and inquired about the inclusion of accessibility accommodations with an online option.

AVP for Faculty Affairs Rudy Sanchez stated that online versions have accessibility options built in and are ADA compliant.

Senator Kim (Economics) asked whether IDEA could make the raw data gathered from student ratings available to faculty of an online option were adopted.

AVP Sanchez (Faculty Affairs) stated that IDEA would not share the raw student-level data with faculty. However, everything available now would remain available. The actual forms completed by students would still be available, but the raw data set would not be available to faculty.

Senator Gilewicz (English) asked how much IDEA would charge if the campus signed a new three-year contract.

Vice President Adishian-Astone stated the cost would be determined as part of the RFP process.

Senator Kensinger (Women's Studies) asked if vendors other than IDEA were likely to provide a paper option.

The Provost responded that this was possible, though vendors were increasingly moving to online options.

Senator Kensinger (Women's Studies) stated there would be a major concern with not having raw data about student responses. If a single

student skews the overall data set there would be no way to know or recalculate those numbers without seeing the raw data. She added that faculty need to be able to see the actual data from each student, especially if a class falls below expectations.

The Provost agreed and added that the campus should carefully examine this in the RFP process.

Senator Sullivan (Sociology) asked if IDEA was likely to eliminate the paper option entirely under a new contract.

The Provost stated that this would be asked in the RFP process. Vice President Adishian-Astone added that it would be important to reflect the expectations of Senators and faculty in the RFP process.

The Provost stated that one of her key takeaways from the January 22 senate meeting were concerns about internal process related to the internal option, and potential faculty workload issues in relation to committee work. The Provost also stated that she had concerns about the possible impact of OIE with an internal option.

Vice President Adishian-Astone stated that from the procurement side it would important to start drafting the RFP so senators would be able to examine the maximum range of options.

Chair Holyoke recognized Dean Fu (Interim Director, OIE).

Dean Fu (OIE) stated that since the January 22 meeting he had undertaken an estimate of OIE staff time based on the Senate's feedback. In doing that, he realized that developing an internal option would create a drain on campus IT resources too. It would require PeopleSoft upgrades, and these would not be possible in the Spring 2018 semester. There is now no way to pilot a process in the current semester because it would require heavy programming on the IT side.

Dean Fu additionally reported that he had heard a piece of advice from IT: The campus could consider leaving the development of an internal option to an outside vendor with expertise in the area. Without IT's commitment and support, an in-house option would not be possible, and there are many layers of uncertainty with the in-house option. Dean Fu concluded

that the best news is that the campus had the option we can buy a one-year extension with IDEA, and suggested looking away from an in-house option for now.

Senator Law (Mechanical Engineering) reported that his department had suggested learn from other CSU campuses about the potential of developing an in-house option.

Dean Fu (OIE) reported that OIE wants to be an implementation arm and provide a service, but OIE cannot make the initial decision on how an internal option would be set up. Those options would be up to faculty.

Senator Chowdhury (Art & Design) asked whether IT was reporting that with current staffing levels an internal option would not be possible and, if that were the case, should new staff be hired.

Chief Information Office Orlando Leon was recognized by Chair Holyoke. CIO Leon reported that his department's recommendation is to wait on the development of an internal option because the July timeframe discussed at the January 22 meeting would be very quick. The IT Department already has many important and time-consuming tasks coming up in April and lasting through the summer. Bringing in a contractor could be an option. A note has already been sent out to other CSUs to benefit from their experience, but there are also industry experts who build good products. An in-house option would offer more ability to customize the system but the campus would need to build a good product of its own.

Senator Bryant (University-wide) asked whether the only semester to pilot an internal option would now be Fall 2018 if IDEA were to grant a one-year extension on the current contract.

Dean Fu (OIE) reported it would be possible to launch a pilot if the decision to move the system in-house were made quickly, but he could not guarantee this with 100% certainty due to the number of stakeholders involved in the process.

CIO Leon stated that campus stakeholders would need to be clear in terms of requirements up-front to avoid scope creep in the development of an internal option.

Senator Karr (Music) recommend Senators take the one-year extension and then empower a panel to compare options for the future.

Senator Dangi (Geography and City and Regional Planning) stated that his department colleagues had raised two issues. The first was that an impression existed that the university's position in the past was to go with IDEA because of resources required for an in-house option. The second view expressed was that an in-house option might be desirable for other reasons. Senator Dangi asked for Dean Fu's opinion on these statements.

Dean Fu (OIE) clarified that student ratings had been run by OIE in the past and OIE staff are highly experienced with this. In addition, OIE had recently estimated that the number of staff hours required for an in-house option would not be tremendous, but OIE would also need support from IT. Dean Fu reiterated that vendors spend thousands of hours developing these systems so the campus would have to carefully examine the internal option.

Matt Zivot (Associate Director, OIE) stated that developing an internal option would require faculty to develop a full question bank, along with default questions for faculty who did not customize their individual surveys. This would add to both faculty and task force workload.

The Provost emphasized that the university is not pressing to save resources or positioned to save money on any system. Faculty satisfaction is the only motivating factor.

Senator Kensinger (Women's Studies) asked whether a paperless option could be developed during a new contract with IDEA.

Vice President Adishian-Astone stated that Procurement needs to issue an RFP at some point and preferred that the campus not extend the current option. However, there was also an appreciation that the process might require another year and therefore an extension.

Senator Alexandrou (Industrial Technology) told the Senate that ensuring reliability and validity of an internally-developed survey would be critical. He argued that the content of the survey would be the most important issue, not the technical aspects, and piloting a reliable survey would take several years

Senator Tsukimura (Ex-officio, Chair, Personnel Committee) provided background information on student ratings. Student rating forms are only a fraction of teaching evaluations and peer evaluations are another part of it. Any questions developed as part of an internal process would need to be valid and reliable. From his committee's perspective, developing a new form could lead to problems and potential grievances in the future.

Senator Tsukimura also raised the potential issue of data security with an internal option, and asked where the data would be stored. With IDEA, all data is housed in the Academic Senate office.

Senator Chowdhury (Art & Design) stated that his department had held a meeting to gauge faculty opinion, and every member expressed a dislike for IDEA.

Chair Holyoke stated that the campus would collect alternative options to IDEA as part of the RFP process.

Senator Yun (Literacy, Early, Bilingual and Special Education) spoke in favor of previous points about reliability and validity and emphasized that it is very difficult and time-consuming to develop an instrument and field test it.

Senator Gilewicz (English) stated that the campus is relying heavily on corporations by using vendor-produced products. She argued that student ratings are measuring subjective rather than scientific factors, and should therefore be developed by faculty who are experts in their own fields.

Senator Ram (University-wide) asked for clarification as to the upgrades to PeopleSoft that would be required to develop an internal option.

CIO Leon answered that pending upgrades to PeopleSoft are a different and unrelated project.

Senator Ram (University-wide) asked whether OIE had administered evaluations at a campus-wide level previously.

Chris Hernandez (OIE) additionally asked where the questions used under the previous OIE-administered system had come from.

Dean Fu (OIE) responded that OIE had administered all evaluations for the campus previously, and that the questions had been developed by faculty.

Senator Ram (University-wide) suggested senators consider dividing the question to ensure a series of clear votes.

Senator Yun (Literacy, Early, Bilingual and Special Education) emphasized that Senators should consider the need to ensure validity and reliability in the potential development of an internal option.

Senator Karr (Music) stated that in his view the most pressing question before the Senate was whether to extend the existing IDEA contract or not.

Chair Holyoke agreed and suggested the Senate had two decisions before it: firstly, whether the current contract with IDEA should be extended and; secondly, whether the campus should pursue the RFP process or develop its own internal option.

Senator Brady (Earth & Environmental Sciences) suggested the Senate should consider pursuing an external or internal option before examining the current IDEA contract.

Chair Holyoke asked Vice President Adishian-Astone if the campus would have time to complete the RFP process without the extension to the current IDEA contract.

Vice President Adishian-Astone answered that it was unlikely this would be possible to complete.

Senator Brady (Earth & Environmental Sciences) emphasized her concern about the faculty labor involved in setting up the internal option.

Senator Karr (Music) stated that faculty time would be involved in any option the campus chose.

Senator Karr moved that the Senate accept the one-year extension from IDEA.

The motion was seconded. The Senate moved to discussion of the motion.

Senator Ram (University-wide) asked if faculty would be able to choose between administering student ratings on paper or online under a extension of the contract with IDEA.

Vice President Adishian-Astone affirmed that this was correct.

Senator Jenkins (Statewide) spoke in favor of the motion.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kensinger (Women's Studies) moved that the campus consider sending out RFPs for the next year and in that time develop a committee to consider the internal option.

Senator Brady (Earth & Environmental Sciences) stated that the campus would need a faculty committee to develop the RFP itself.

Senator Karr moved to separate the question into calling for the RFP and also developing the committee.

The Senate parliamentarian ruled that the motion could be separated.

Chair Holyoke presented the draft charge for an ad hoc task force.

Senator Jones (Communication) asked if the charge would need to be changed to develop an internal instrument.

Chair Holyoke stated that the task force charge itself could be dealt with at a later time, and asked Vice President Adishian-Astone what the process for evaluating an RFP would involve.

Vice President Adishian-Astone stated that the Senate would be able to convene its own committee to evaluate the options emerging from the RFP process. There would also be representation from Procurement.

Chair Holyoke stated he would draft a charge for the task force and present it to the Executive Committee in due course.

The question was called on the first part of the separated motion. The motion was revised to call for the campus to "Send out an RFP and create a task force to advise on the RFP."

Senator Jenkins (Statewide) called a point of order and stated that the motion had been changed from its original intent.

Senator Karr (Music) stated that he considered the amendments to his motion to be friendly.

Senator Henson (English) asked for clarification as to whether the proposed task force would help develop the RFP, or whether it would only evaluate the proposals submitted by vendors.

Senator Karr (Music) stated that his intent was to establish a task force to advise at all stages of the RFP process.

Chair Holyoke stated that in his understanding there is generally a faculty task force involved in developing an RFP.

Vice President Adishian-Astone affirmed that Chair Holyoke's understanding was correct.

Chair Holyoke reported that under the motion on the floor, the task force would develop the RFP, advise on the process and guide the final decision.

Chair Holyoke told the Senate he would provide a draft structure of the task force at the next meeting for consideration.

The motion was restated to read that the Senate would "recommend that an RFP be sent and a task force be formed to oversee creation of RFP, guide the process and then make an advisory recommendation on the final decision."

Senator Brady (Earth & Environmental Sciences) asked for clarification as to whether the proposed committee would be involved in every part of the process.

Chair Holyoke answered in the affirmative.

Senator Chowdhury (Art & Design) asked whether a potential internal option included was being included in the scope of the task force's work.

Chair Holyoke answered in the negative.

The motion passed (1-nay).

The question was called on the second part of the previous motion: "To create another task force to guide OIE on developing an internal option."

Senator Kensinger (Women's Studies) stated that the intent of the motion was to explore the internal option with OIE and find out if it's even feasible.

CIO Leon stated that the task force examining the RFP process could also provide information that might help with a potential internal option as well.

Senator Brady (Earth & Environmental Sciences) argued that the key issue to consider with the internal option was the development of the questions, not the technical implementation itself.

Dean Fu reiterated that OIE's involvement would come into the process once the instrument itself had been developed.

Senator Ram (University-wide) stated that such a task force should include representation from IT.

Senator Jones (Communication) agreed with Senator Ram and suggested the inclusion of a liaison between the two task forces.

Senator Alexandrou (Industrial Technology) stated that if the task force were to develop its own set of questions it would take several years to properly test them.

The motion was restated to call for the Senate to "convene a task force to assess the feasibility of an internal system."

Chair Holyoke stated that he would bring a draft version of the charge for the task force to the Senate's next meeting.

The motion was approved (1-nay).

The Academic Senate adjourned at 5:21pm. The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be on Monday, February 5, 2018.

Submitted by   Approved by
Bradley Hart   Thomas Holyoke
Vice Chair   Chair
Academic Senate   Academic Senate