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Members excused:

Members absent:

In-person attendance: Zoom attendance:

The Academic Senate was called to order by **Chair Hall** at 4:05 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 03/04/2024.

*Motion to approve minutes*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to approve minutes: approved*

1. Communications and Announcements.

**Senator Kensinger** asked the **Provost** to explain changes to GE from Board of Trustees. The **Provost** explained that the Chancellor’s Office revised Title V to synchronize GE pathway among CC, CSU, and UC. Board of Trustees will discuss at March meeting. If changes are approved, Fresno State will lose 6 lower-division units in GE by losing C3 and Area E. The campus will decide where to place 6 units. Dropped GE areas could become campus requirements, or we could use 6 units for other purposes.

**Senator Chowdhury** expressed concern about how this change affects College of Arts and Humanities and asked the **Provost** if affected program areas will decide how 6 units are allocated. The **Provost** responded that if it passes, the Senate will likely call for a faculty task force. **Chair Hall** explained that faculty will decide, similar to how Political Science moved course to campus requirement. **Senator Kensinger** agreed with **Senator Chowdhury’s** concerns and informed state senators that she opposes this change. **Senator Kensinger** expressed concern about how this change was made without awareness of CSU processes. **Senator Kensinger** is also concerned that many faculty are just hearing about this change and that the Chancellor’s Office is interfering with GE when it should be in the purview of the faculty.

**Chair Hall** explained that faculty did oppose the change and sent a strongly worded resolution with other CSUs, but the Trustees are empowered.

**Senator Chowdhury** asked if contact information for the Trustees can be sent to Senators. **Chair Hall** responded that the only contact information that is available is on the Trustees website.

**Senator Bryant** clarified that the conversation about GE has been ongoing for a year and a half and that the changes have mostly been driven by UC.

**Senator Kensinger** apologized for previous remarks given **Senator Bryant’s** points.

**Senator Ram** asked what department University 1 is located in. The **Provost** responded that it is located in Kremen and only recommended for students who seem to need support. We do not have a university wide first year experience course.

**Senator Kensinger** shared that she thinks University 1 came about because remedial courses were removed.

**Chair Hall** explained that University 1 is about acclimating students to campus. It is not a math or English remedial course.

**Chair Hall** encourages senators to consider serving on ACAL standing committee as a faculty representative. The first meeting is on March 15 at 1 PM over Zoom.

1. New Business

*None*

1. APM 220 – Program Review. Second Reading

*Discussion on amendment to Section VIII of APM 220:*

**Senator Walsh** spoke with F. Nelson, chair of UAPRS, and the recommendation is to revise the amendment because the committees want to use an expedited process and write a memo of concern if needed. Committees do not feel it appropriate to oppose a report from a national accrediting body and it would be a lot of work to write a report based on recommendations in Section VI.

***Chair Hall*** *recognized* ***Maritere Lopez*** *of UGC to respond*

**M. Lopez** explained that other language in the APM has the committees identify the parts of the program review that align with University criteria without having to review entire technical document from accrediting body. **M. Lopez** expressed concern with recommendations from **F. Nelson** and UAPRS because it removes meaningful oversight by committee.

**Senator Kensinger** thanked **M. Lopez** and **Senator Walsh** for helping senators understand the issue. Would like to keep amendment as is.

**Senator Stillmaker** spoke in favor of the amendment because faculty need to have oversight and give a recommendation. **Senator Stillmaker** expressed concern that UAPRS does not feel able to review the programs. **Senator Stillmaker** argued that UAPRS should be able to review report from accrediting agency and this amendment prevents UAPRS from developing own policy.

**Senator Chowdhury** expressed concern that accrediting agency could not recommend a program for different reasons while faculty program review may still recommend the program and not suspend the program.

**Senator Walsh** clarified that **F. Nelson** did not mean that UAPRS cannot review materials, but that workload could increase if reviewing full reports from accrediting agencies. **Senator Walsh** also expressed concern for how this affects programs in Kremen that credential students. **Senator Walsh** explained that programs may be stopped immediately or get a probationary period after being denied accreditation.

**Senator Lent** is in favor of the amendment and pointed to the categories in the APM and how they can be useful for supporting programs in situations where accreditation is denied.

**Senator Ram** suggested changing language so that committee reviews recommendation or conclusions rather than materials.

**M. Lopez** noted that the language in Section VIII already points to specific documents rather than entire report.

*Vote on motion to amend Section VIII of APM 220: approved*

**Senator Kensinger** proposed moving language about committee chair following up with program representatives to before UAPRS/UGC review.

*Motion to amend Section VIII of APM 220*

*Second*

*Motion withdrawn*

**Senator Chowdhury** would like language to create a remediation process or internal review for programs that don’t pass accreditation.

**Senator Walsh** argued that this issue is addressed in Section VIII in the last paragraph.

**Senator Bryant** asked if a program that loses national accreditation would not just then fall under the rest of the APM.

**M. Lopez** responded that this is not the case because it would be in the same cycle. But having faculty oversight allows to differentiate between programs that are viable and programs that are not.

**Senator Stillmaker** noted that Section VIII says programs “may” undergo abbreviated review. **M. Lopez** responded that it should say “must.”

**Senator Chowdhury** expressed concern that committee may be adversarial.

**Senator Kensinger** motioned to amend Section VIII to allow appeal process when there are discrepancies in recommendations.

*Motion to amend Section VIII of APM 220*

*Second*

**Senator Lent** noted that this is not needed because protection is already built in to APM. Committees cannot end a program that is deemed to be okay.

**Chair Hall** agreed that there is another APM for discontinuing programs and language may not be needed in APM 220.

**Senator Jones** noted that program discontinuation policy is 214 for undergraduate programs, and 223 is for graduate programs. **Senator Walsh** suggested that language can direct to other APMs.

**Senator Mulhern** shared that she sees important points on both sides and asked if language can address both issues, when programs need time to correct and when programs are fine but did not get accredited.

**Senator Panagopoulos** asked how accrediting agency is recognized in the process and if there is even a point in having abbreviated review. **Senator Panagopoulos** agrees with amendment but does not think it is enough.

**Senator Kensinger** responded that the discontinuation APM does not cover the issue that amendment addresses.

**M. Lopez** noted that this issue is already addressed in the process because committee’s memo goes back to department/program and department/program can respond.

**Senator Kensinger** shared that she would like to withdraw her amendment.

*Vote on amendment to Section VIII of APM 220: approved*

**Senator Lent** noted that this APM now needs to be aligned with other APMs on discontinuation.

**Senator Walsh** noted that this APM needs to reference other APMs on discontinuance.

**Senator Lent** also noted that this process now needs to be described in the guide on program reviews.

**Senator Ram** asked if there is a policy that can be referred to. **M. Lopez** responded that the process is already in an earlier section of APM 220. **M. Lopez** explained again the purpose of Section VIII and that it does not supersede the rest of the APM. **Senator Walsh** suggested including references to previous sections.

*Motion to amend Section VIII of APM 220*

*Second*

**Senator Stillmaker** noted that there are no sections that address a response and he is against the amendment.

**Senator Lent** noted that being able to formally respond is already in the process and the language is redundant. In favor of amendment as a fix to previous approved amendment.

**Senator Walsh** noted that Section V has process for responding when program review is not abbreviated.

**Senator Lone** explained the parliamentary procedure for correcting a previous amendment, which must happen in the next session.

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

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

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be March 18, 2024.
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