

THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO  
5200 N. Barton Ave UL34  
Fresno, California 93740-8014  
Office of the Academic Senate  
(559) 278-2743

(AS-9)

November 6, 2023

Members excused: M. Calahorra-Jimenez

Members absent: M. Hernandez, R. Klepper, T. Kubal, D. Lopez, S. Miller,  
A. Panagopoulos, S. Pao, J. Pitts, J. Randles, G. Sandi  
Diaz, R. Sias

In-person attendance: 21                      Zoom attendance: 31

The Academic Senate was called to order by **Chair Hall** at 4:03 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*

2. Approval of the Minutes 10/30/23.

*Motion to approve minutes*

*Second*

*Vote to approve minutes: approved*

3. Communications and Announcements.

*Questions for Provost Fu:*

**Senator Mason:** It is hot and humid in classrooms, and it's taking a toll on instruments. What are we going to do about this issue?

**Provost Fu:** We will talk to facilities people, we will try to see what the solution is. My understanding is that the change in temperature is due to the construction on campus.

**Senator Mason:** I called Mark Sine and heard from him that there is nothing we can do about it

**Provost Fu:** The solution is to resolve the air flow

**Senator Mason:** My instruments have started deteriorating.

**Senator Kensinger:** Solidarity with colleagues, also affects science disciplines. suggestion Debbie Astone should attend the next meeting.

**Chair Hall:** We will reach out and communicate this concern.

**Senator Mulhern:** Teachers have reported having to cancel classes because of the temperature problems.

**Senator Bryant:** Faculty rooms have been either too hot or freezing cold for months. Two faculty complained to me about their offices being too hot.

**Chair Hall:** I have a colleague who has complained as well. There is a consensus that this is a problem.

**Senator Archambault:** I have been taking air quality readings in my classrooms at Peters Business building. My classroom's CO2 readings are over the recommended. Over 1700 ppm, recommended is 800 ppm by OSHA. This is an environmental concern. I was going to bring this up outside of the Senate because it is an OSHA violation.

**Chair Hall:** When you send that email, please make sure to CC me.

Communications from Statewide Senator Schlievert:

**Senator Schlievert:** Had statewide meetings for four days last week. The topics we covered were the passing of the review of the tenancy of shared governance. The rest of these are first readings on GE and transfer

pathways, collaboration on Title 5 changes, curriculum review, applications of Cal-GETC standards, and notation of subject matter program completion on student transcripts. Asking for continuing COVID-19 mitigation and air quality on CSU campuses, Black student success, genocide and a statement about that, support of CalPERS, fossil fuel divestment, change in advocacy positions on monitored legislative bills. And finally, conversations on ensuring temporary faculty positions on the ASCSU.

Communications from Chair Hall:

**Chair Hall:** We'll get the Monday before Thanksgiving off and meet the following Monday. Next meeting moved to next week instead of the week of Thanksgiving. Let me know if there are any concerns. If the room is booked, we'll cancel the meeting for the next two weeks and regroup after Thanksgiving.

4. New Business

*None*

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

**Senator Kensinger:** This got tabled and sent back. I need some clarification on why?

**Chair Hall:** Senators wanted a chance to process the changes.

**Senator Walsh:** There was also a response from Laura Yager.

**Senator Jones:** Apostrophe is in the wrong place.

**Chair Hall:** There was a question on what exams are we talking about. The only exams we are talking about are AP, IB, and CLEP exams.

**Senator Jones:** This proposal does not have complete sentences. A comment from L. Yager is missing.

**Chair Hall:** The change should have been a note.

**Senator Jones:** Our draft has a full sentence.

**Chair Hall:** I recognize that. We took that out and made it a comment as it should have been.

**Senator Walsh:** The issue was what type of credit we provide. That is what the Executive Order is asking for. I copied that straight from the EO. The question was what is currently occurring. L. Yager provided these two components here. It sounds like we review it in terms of GE or major. So do we just write major? The articulation officer reviews to determine GE or major. The Executive Order states that we as a university decide. That is not what happens here at Fresno State.

**Senator Kensinger:** We could say, at Fresno State this decision could be left to the programs and department for decision, or we could say there is a university standard. or we could say we do not want this at all.

**Senator Walsh:** We can't do that. L. Yager told us what we're doing right now, which is to give credit for GE or major.

**Senator Kensinger:** I would like to hear what would be helpful to you.

**Chair Hall:** Do we want to propose some different language, or move it along?

**Senator Stillmaker:** I propose an amendment that we take Senator Walsh's comment.

*Motion to amend Section III.A of APM 218  
Second*

**Senator Kensinger:** I propose a friendly amendment, should be and/or.

**Senator Walsh:** Want to make sure amendment captures L. Yager's comments.

**Senator Mason:** Can you read the changes that are being made?

**Chair Hall:** Reads the changes made

**Senator Kensinger:** I propose a friendly amendment to go back to GE and/or Major.

*Vote on motion to amend Section III.A of APM 218: approved*

**Chair Hall:** L. Yager had a question. Is there a reason why we call it a challenge exam instead of credit by examination?

**Senator Walsh:** This was the language from the Executive Order. we should call it what we call it here, as long as it means the same thing.

**Chair Hall:** Let's make a friendly amendment to change the language to credit by examination.

**Senator Ram:** Standardized exam and credit by examination clarification. The Executive Order puts the standardized exams and these challenge exams under the same credit for examination. We should have campus originated somewhere in the language to distinguish from standardized external exams

**Senator Peterson:** If we start changing here we are going to need to go back up and change the language there. If it doesn't matter I suggest we leave it. If it doesn't change the meaning, then leave it as is.

**Chair Hall:** Withdraw proposal to edit the name

**Senator Kensinger:** Question on struck language in Section III.B. Confused about where that strike came from.

**Senator Walsh:** I was just honoring the notes. I agree that this one needs to stay. The language is straight from the Executive Order.

**Senator Ram:** I had a question about this that led to this language getting struck. I asked if this is Executive Order policy or university policy?

**Senator Walsh:** This came from L. Yager.

**Chair Hall:** We do not unanimously agree with striking this language. Somebody will have to make a motion to discuss it.

**Senator Kensinger:** I understand standardized exams. Are challenge exams only meant for the majors?

**Senator Ram:** Can someone answer the question, whether the committee decided to put this in or is this university policy in which you can't challenge GE courses?

**Senator Lent:** I don't know the answer. I would argue against striking it. Broader discussion among departments on what is a GE or university requirement. If you want to advocate for a challenge exam, you would have to consult all the different departments for them to meet some university standard. I argue against striking it.

**Senator Mulhern:** Striking this language would be inconsistent with some past practices of the Senate. Striking this could lead to people being certified without ever taking a course here.

**Chair Hall:** I think we should have a vote on this. We need a motion to strike it.

**Senator Walsh:** My recommendation would be not to strike it.

*Motion to strike language in Section III.B of APM 218  
Second*

**Chair Hall:** The motion on the floor is to unstrike the language.

**Senator Kensinger:** University requirements are not department decisions, this language needs to be there. The language to strike section E can be struck.

**Senator Stillmaker:** I wonder if there is a situation in which people get GE credit. Should there be a university committee to decide when GE credits can be given?

**Senator Walsh:** That is why there is credit for prior learning. There is language in the catalog where students can't just challenge every credit, we do not want to create a loophole, but we also want to give students the opportunity to earn these credits.

**Senator Ram:** In political science, students could take a challenge exam for American politics. We should be aware that this may be a new university policy.

*Vote on motion to strike language in Section III.B of APM 218: denied*

**Senator Walsh:** Clarification on the language use in Section D.

**Senator Mulhern:** It seems like it repeats words, but it specifies that this is assessment of course-based learning.

**Senator Walsh:** Reads from the Executive Order. It's about the knowledge they have outside of the course that is applied in the course. Does not have to be course-based learning.

**Senator Mulhern:** As long as this is not an attempt for APM to restrict the effect of the legislative move, then I withdraw my concerns.

**Senator Walsh:** We clarified that a few weeks back.

**Chair Hall:** Language strike discussion on Section IV.B

**Senator Ram:** The Executive Order does not mention prerequisites. I was wondering the justification for having that language there. Can we clarify why this has been struck?

**Senator Mulhern:** Concern is entry to a course but you don't have a prerequisite, and since you took that course getting credit for the prerequisite that you didn't pass. I hate to add to the policy, but I think this should stay.

**Senator Stillmaker:** Seems better to strike this language, because in the case where students have taken a course where they haven't taken the prerequisite, they should be able to challenge the prerequisite instead of going back and having to take it.

**Senator Smith:** We have a lot of students trying to challenge, and this would make faculty have to create a lot of challenge exams.

**Senator Mulhern:** It matters more in the humanities, because students could, for example, skip taking a class about gender and then challenge it retroactively. This has been deployed in religious studies to avoid taking gender prerequisites. Arguing against the strike.

**Chair Hall:** You're arguing against the strike, correct?

**Senator Mulhern:** Correct

**Senator Chowdhury:** Because a student challenges a credit, does that force us to make a challenge exam? It seems like it would be up to department policy to decide if this is allowed.

**Chair Hall:** Is there any mandate in the policy that departments must provide a challenge exam?

**Senator Walsh:** The spirit of the EO is trying to find a shared place to honor students who want to challenge credits without letting them challenge their entire program. It's a protection so that we don't have people doing what was brought up. In some contexts it is appropriate and in others it is not, so we are trying to honor that. we don't want someone to take advantage of it. How can we word it in such a way that honors both? It is not a right to demand, it's a right to be considered.

**Senator Wise:** Is there an application process that can go through the department curriculum committee?

**Senator Kensinger:** We changed who we are speaking to in this section. If we go back to definition on challenge exams. This section speaks to what students cannot do, it changes the tenor and who we are speaking to, compared to earlier when it seemed to address departments, programs, registrar, etc.

**Senator Stillmaker:** I might have changed my opinion. Registrar policy says prerequisites must be taken before taking a course that requires them. This language aligns with that.

**Senator Walsh:** Now and again students are allowed to take prerequisites at the same time. for the most part that is correct

**Senator Peterson:** It's redundant anyways, so why do you have to state it here? I'm arguing just to keep it.

**Senator Vega:** Permission numbers allow students to take any course, even without prerequisites.

**Senator Mulhern:** Point of clarification, can you say which policy this is again? If the APM has a different constituency, whose policy is this? Does APM have to be consistent with the registrar's policy? They have different constituencies.

**Senator Stillmaker:** This policy comes from the registrar's office

**Senator Walsh:** Reviewing language from Executive Order. The language is general. Available upon request.

**Senator Jones:** Catalog includes language that states this is to permit students to accelerate progress toward degree.

**Senator Walsh:** To follow up on that, this was supposed to be in our policy.

**Chair Hall:** Language to put a further restriction on when students can request challenge exams.

*Motion to retain stricken language in Section IV.B of APM 218*  
*Second*

**Senator Holyoke:** Unclear what Executive Order is requiring? Is Executive Order requiring that we say everything can be challenged?

**Senator Walsh:** Yes, if they request it, but only on appropriate courses.

**Senator Holyoke:** You cannot unilaterally forbid challenges

**Senator Walsh:** Correct

**Senator Chowdhury:** I'm still not clear whether a department needs to provide a challenge exam upon a student's request. Does the policy obligate us to provide an exam upon request?

**Senator Stillmaker:** I read that it does require departments to provide challenge exams. The California legislature told us we have to.

**Senator Kensinger:** Our policy says that departments may provide challenge exams, except UR and GE requirements.

**Senator Walsh:** If we feel like it is not appropriate to challenge a prerequisite we need to discuss here what is appropriate to challenge and what is not.

**Senator Chowdhury:** Propose amendment to leave it to the discretion of the department.

**Chair Hall:** Not sure that would be in compliance with the EO.

**Senator Holyoke:** If someone has a good idea, please bring your amendment next time.

**Senator Bryant:** Point of clarification, it is a Chancellor's Executive Order, not a Governor's Executive Order.

**Chair Hall:** But they are referencing Title V.

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

---

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be November 13, 2023.

Submitted by  
Amber Crowell  
Vice Chair  
Academic Senate

Approved by  
Ray Hall  
Chair  
Academic Senate