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Members excused: Hyung Tae Kim

Members absent:

In-person attendance:24 Zoom attendance: 37

The Academic Senate was called to order by **Chair Hall** at 4:01 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 02/26/2024.

*Motion to approve minutes*

*Second*

*Vote on motion to approve minutes: approved*

1. Communications and Announcements.

**Chair Hall** encourages faculty to nominate themselves or encourage others to nominate for search committee for Senior Associate Athletic Director for Athletic Business Operations. Call for service will go out again.

1. New Business

*None*

1. APM 220 – Program Review. Second Reading

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

**M. Lopez** proposed a friendly amendment to amendment because language does not account for University Graduate Committee, which also has a program review subcommittee.

*Friendly amendment accepted*

**Senator Ram** noted that a manual is not mentioned in the amended paragraph and would like to know what the manual is referring to.

*Friendly amendment accepted to remove mentions of “manual”*

**Senator Ram** asked about last paragraph of Section I referring to program review. **Senator Walsh** noted that this should be hyperlinked.

**Senator Kensinger** proposed a friendly amendment to move amendment to after language about referring to manual.

*Friendly amendment accepted*

**Senator Holyoke** proposed a friendly amendment to add “& guidelines” after “procedures”

*Friendly amendment accepted*

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

**Senator Kensinger** asked chair of committee if manual will have dates on when responses are due. **M. Lopez** responded that this is not the purview of their committee. **Senator Walsh** explained that the manual has a checklist and timeline for program review and is more specific on the website. **Senator Walsh** confirmed that manual is explicit about responsibilities.

**Chair Hall** requested that the hyperlink to manual be included in minutes.

[Procedures & Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs](https://academics.fresnostate.edu/documents/curriculum/Procedures%20and%20Guidelines%20for%20Review%20of%20Academic%20Programs%2012.08.22.pdf)

**Senator Ram** proposed an amendment to change the title of Section V to “Responses to the Review Panel Report”

**Senator Walsh** noted that it is referred to as Review Team in the manual.

*Friendly amendment accepted*

**Senator Ram** proposed a friendly amendment to change “reports” to singular in Section VI.

*Friendly amendment accepted*

**Senator Kensinger** asked if abbreviated review includes a statement from any university committee on recommendations.

**M. Lopez** responded that faculty representation had been taken out of process, so these changes bring in appropriate program review committee to review documents and raise concerns with program/department faculty. Under this scenario, the committee would write a recommendation. **M. Lopez** also noted that the language needs to be amended to bring UAPRS back in.

*Friendly amendment accepted to unstrike mentions of UAPRS in Section VIII of APM 220.*

**Senator Kensinger** asked if site visit report includes review categories that University reviews have to include. **M. Lopez** responded no. **Senator Kensinger** proposed an amendment to Section VIII.

*Motion to amend Section VIII of APM 220*

*Second*

**M. Lopez** noted that the language just below already addresses this, but can be made more specific. **Senator Kensinger** responded that the language **M. Lopez** referred to involves Section VII, not Section VI.

**Senator Kensinger** explained concern that outside accrediting agency will approve a program when University committee might not. **M. Lopez** responded that this issue is addressed by bringing faculty representation back in through proposed Section VIII.

**Senator Walsh** noted that changes to this section were to avoid workload issues for programs that are nationally accredited by requiring two reports. We should be cautious about not requiring the University process on top of process through accreditation.

**Senator Ram** proposed a friendly amendment to remove mention of consent calendar and rephrase the amendment.

*Friendly amendment accepted*

**M. Lopez** explained that there was pushback on this language from UAPRS and preference for consent calendar. Committee would review an abbreviated report, not full report. UGC compromised with UAPRS to put it on consent calendar and let UAPRS decide if they choose to review it more fully. Senate can decide if they want committee to do full review of abbreviated review. **Senator Walsh** agreed that this is the feedback they got from UAPRS because the reviews can be lengthy. UAPRS had preference to put it on consent calendar.

**Chair Hall** asked under what circumstances they would pull from consent calendar. **Senator Walsh** responded that it goes back to Section VI and issues that can come up there. **Chair Hall** explained to the Senate that any member can pull something from consent calendar for discussion.

**Senator Kensinger** would like to table until next Monday to reflect on concerns of committee and her own concerns.

*Motion to table APM 220*

*Second*

**Senator Chowdhury** expressed a concern that the APM does not offer any release time to faculty for program review.

**Senator Mulhern** asked if senators will have the most up to date redlined document. **Chair Hall** confirmed this.

*Vote on motion to table APM 220: approved*

1. APM 399 – Policy on Emerita and Emeritus Status. Second Reading

**Senator Holyoke** proposed amendment to Section IV of APM 399

*Motion to amend Section IV of APM 399*

*Second*

**Senator Holyoke** explained that the purpose of this amendment is to allow faculty involvement in the process of revoking status.

**Chair Hall** asked **D. Low** if this amendment addresses his concern that the President may have information that they can’t legally share. **D. Low** responded that the “if possible” in amendment addresses this concern.

**Senator Jones** proposed a friendly amendment to include program coordinators and capitalize President.

*Friendly amendment accepted*

**Senator Wise** asked for clarification that faculty cannot stop the revocation of status, but can respond.

**Senator Bryant** proposed friendly amendments to mention program coordinators throughout.

*Friendly amendment accepted*

*Vote on motion to amend Section IV of APM 399: approved*

**Senator Van Camp** raised concern that language in Section V does not make it clear what the response period is.

**Senator Mulhern** proposed a friendly amendment to have it say “21 days of receipt of the decision”

*Friendly amendment accepted*

**AVP Schmidtke** raised concern that emeriti faculty may not receive notice if they cannot be contacted, so 21 days of receipt of decision may mean the response period never begins.

**Senator Mortimer** proposed an amendment to change 21 days to 42 days.

*Motion to amend Section V of APM 399*

*Second*

**Senator Mulhern** spoke against this amendment because it is more important that the faculty be informed. **Senator Mortimer** responded that it is difficult to know when the information is received since it will be mailed and not emailed.

**Senator Ram** commented that she is not sure if 42 days is better than 21, and that the language should say that it is within 21 days of notification of the decision.

**Chair Hall** asked **AVP Schmidtke** if faculty are required to check their email. **AVP Schmidtke** responded that that is true for current faculty.

**Senator Mulhern** expressed concern with shift of ethical burden and that faculty who missed the window did not get a chance to respond.

*Vote on motion to amend Section V of APM 399: approved*

**Senator Kensinger** asked for clarification on Section II and where in the procedure faculty are notified of decision. **Senator Kensinger** would also like to know why all tenured faculty are now involved in the decision. **Senator** **Kensinger** also asked if all full-time faculty are required to write the letter. **Senator Kensinger** also spoke in support of changes to APM to grant status to lecturers.

**AVP Schmidtke** responded that change from professors to faculty was because there are departments where there are not many full professors.

**Senator Lent** proposed an amendment to Section II.2 to include a recorded vote from faculty in nomination to President.

*Motion to amend Section II.2 of APM 399*

*Second*

**Senator Kensinger** spoke in favor of this amendment.

*The Academic Senate adjourned at 5:16 p.m.*

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

The next meeting of the Academic Senate will be March 4, 2024.
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