I. Minutes:
Approval of minutes for Academic Senate meetings of March 2 and March 9 2010 (pp. 2-5).

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA Campus President:
G. ASI Representative:
H. Committee Chair(s):

IV. Consent Agenda:
Curriculum proposal: approval of SS 131, Soils in Environmental and Agricultural Systems: Hannings, chair of Curriculum Committee (p. 6).

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Selection Process for the Nomination of Faculty Representatives to the Advisory Committee for the Selection of Campus President: Executive Committee, second reading (pp. 7-11).
B. Resolution on Addition to Academic Senate Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Include Process for First and Second Readings: Executive Committee, second reading (pp. 11-13).
C. Resolution on Private Donors: Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 14-16).
D. Resolution on Establishment of an Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee: Hannings, chair of Curriculum Committee, first reading (pp. 17-19).

VI. Special Report(s):
Erling Smith: Update on Strategic Plan.

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment:
II. Minutes: Minutes of the February 9, 2010 Academic Senate meeting were approved.

II. Communications and Announcements: none.

III. Regular Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores will make available to all Senators a letter drafted by Shawn Whalen, Academic Senate Chair for San Francisco State, imploring legislators to support the Governor in restoring funding to higher education. Senators are encouraged to distribute the letter to others in their college as well as staff and students. The Academic Senate Instruction Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee will be reviewing the issues associated with a class taught in the OCOB during fall of 2009 as well as the Michael Pollan/Harris Ranch issue. In discussing these issues, a clearer view of the relations between academic freedom, donors, and curriculum needs to be addressed.

B. President’s Office: none.

C. Provost’s Office: none.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs: Morton reported that the Interfraternity Council (IFC) has decided to defer rush by barring new students from joining fraternities during their first quarter of enrollment. Student Affairs applauds the decision made by an overwhelming majority of the IFC leadership.

E. Statewide Senators: LoCascio reported the retirement of system wide Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, Dr. Jeri Echevarria. Forooahar announced that the statewide Faculty Affairs Committee is working on a resolution that asks the Chancellor’s Office and local administrators working with advancement staff to communicate to possible donors the principles of academic freedom.

F. CFA Campus President: none.

G. ASI: Rugani announced that San Diego State has created a survey to see how furloughs are affecting students. ASI will compile the result of this system wide survey and present their findings at a later date. At its next board meeting, ASI will be discussing college council spending procedures in order to make all councils aware of available funds.

H. Committee Chair(s): Rinzler, Member of the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee, reported on additional stimulus funds received by Cal Poly to increase access to critical courses in fall 2010. The Chancellor’s Office calculated the cost per course in every campus to be $6,250 while the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee calculated that it costs Cal Poly $11,000 per course. Fisher, Chair of the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee, added that the goal of the committee is to raise the expertise of the faculty on budgetary issues by having the committee members serve as experts for their college.
IV. Business Items:
A. **Resolution on Proposal for the Establishment of the University Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship**: (Orfalea College of Business): Tornatzky, OCOB Faculty, presented the resolution which requests that the Academic Senate endorse the establishment of the center. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

B. **Resolution on MS Fire Protection Engineering Program**: (College of Engineering): Hannings, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented the resolution which requests that the Academic Senate endorse the implementation of the program. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

C. **Resolution on Campus Wide Change of Major Policy**: (Curriculum Committee): Hannings, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented the resolution which requests that the Academic Senate approve and recommend to President Baker the campus wide adoption of the Change of Major Policy. Resolution will return as a second reading item at the next meeting.

D. **Resolution on revision of Cal Poly Mission Statement to Include Staff**: (Executive Committee): Fernflores, Academic Senate Chair, presented this resolution which recommends for approval a revision to the Cal Poly Mission Statement in which the contributions of staff are recognized. M/S/P to move the resolution to a second reading. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

V. Consent Agenda: The curriculum proposals for AERO, CSC/CPE, and FPE were approved.

VI. Special Report: none.

VII. Discussion Item: none.

VIII. Adjournment: 5:00pm

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407  
ACADEMIC SENATE  
MINUTES OF  
The Academic Senate  
Tuesday, March 9 2010  
UU 220, 3:00 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications and Announcements: none.

III. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores reported that 15 campuses have participated in sending 1,058 messages to the legislators as a result of a letter drafted by Shawn Whalen, Academic Senate Chair for San Francisco State, imploring legislators to support the Governor in restoring funding to higher education. Senators are encouraged to distribute the letter to others in their college as well as staff and students.

B. President’s Office: none.

C. Provost’s Office: Koob announced that Kimi Ikeda and Richard Ramirez are reviewing a memorandum received from the Chancellor’s Office with regards to fees for summer session. It appears that Cal Poly will be allowed to charge most campus activities fees but not ASI fees.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs: none.

E. Statewide Senators: none.

F. CFA Campus President: Saenz reported that last Thursday’s off campus rally was successful. CFA is soliciting candidates for next year.

G. ASI: none.

H. Committee Chair(s): none.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
A. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2010-2011: The following appointments were made by acclamation:
   Academic Senate Chair – Rachel Fernflores, Philosophy
   Academic Senate Vice-Chair – Camille O’Bryant, Kinesiology

B. Resolution on Campus Wide Change of Major Policy (Curriculum Committee): Hannings, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, presented the resolution which requests that the Academic Senate approve and recommend to President Baker the campus wide adoption of the Change of Major Policy. The following friendly amendment was approved:
   Resolved: That provost ensure the timely implementation of this policy and require deans to provide feedback to him/her on the progress and effectiveness of this policy, M/S/P to approve the resolution.
C. **Resolution on Selection Process for the Nomination of Faculty Representative to the Advisory Committee for the Selection of Campus President (Executive Committee):** Fernflores, Chair of the Academic Senate, presented the resolution which requests the adoption of the attached policy for faculty selection to serve on the Advisory Committee to the Trustee Committee for the Selection of the President, as standing policy. Resolution will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting of April 6, 2010.

D. **Resolution on Addition to Academic Senate Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Include Process for First and Second Readings (Executive Committee):** Fernflores presented the resolution, which provides guidelines to be used by the Academic Senate for first and second readings. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

VI. Special Report: none.

VII. Discussion Item: none.

VIII: Adjournment: 5:00pm

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
Continuous Course/Curriculum Summary
For Academic Senate Consent Agenda

Note: The following courses/programs have been summarized by staff in the Registrar's Office for review by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) and Academic Senate (AS)

Date: March 12, 2010

Winter/Spring 2010 Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate (AS)</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 131 Soils in Environmental and Agricultural Systems (4) 3 lec 1 act</td>
<td>Approved 3/11/10</td>
<td>April 13 On Consent Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents indicates that there will be an advisory committee to the Trustees committee in the selection of CSU Presidents (http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/PresidentialSearch.shtml). The Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSU) is to include the CSU campus Academic Senate Chair plus two faculty representatives. The two faculty representatives are to be elected by the campus faculty or, if a standing policy allows for the forgoing of a faculty election, that standing policy needs to be revised or ratified with each new presidential search; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has no standing policy for selecting the two faculty representatives to ACTCSU; and

WHEREAS, In January 2010, the Academic Senate used the consent agenda process to adopt the provisional policy, attached, for the election of two faculty representatives to the ACTCSU; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the policy, below, which is a slightly revised version of the provisional policy, henceforth be the standing policy for the election of two faculty representatives to future incarnations of the ACTCSU:

ACADEMIC SENATE SELECTION PROCESS FOR THE NOMINATION OF TWO FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE TRUSTEE COMMITTEE FOR THE SELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

1. The Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents (BOT Policy) specifies that in addition to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President established by the Office of the Chancellor, an Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) serves as one of the consultative groups in the selection of campus Presidents. Among the members of the ACTCSP is the Chair of the Academic Senate and two (2) "faculty representatives elected by the faculty" (http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/PresidentialSearch.shtml).
2. The nomination and election of the two faculty representatives to the ACTCSP shall be by and from those members of the General Faculty as defined by the Constitution of the Faculty (Article 1).

3. In order to provide the fullest possible representation of the colleges given the constraints of the BOT Policy, the combination of the two faculty representatives plus the Chair of the Academic Senate shall all come from separate colleges/Professional Consultative Services (PCS). Together the three shall have the following college affiliations: The two elected faculty representatives will be at-large positions.

A. One representative from either CLA or CSM.
B. One representative from CAFES, CAED, CENG, OCOB.
C. The second elected position will be an at-large position. It will go to the nominee who receives the next highest votes and is not faculty from either the college of the Senate Chair or the first elected person.
D. In the event that one of the two elected representatives is unable to serve at any time during the search, the nominee who received the next highest number of votes in the election according to the specifications in 3 (including 3A-C) will serve in his or her stead.

4. To become a nominee for one of the two representative positions, an eligible member of the faculty must submit to the Chair of the Academic Senate the following:

A. A statement not to exceed 200 words indicating how he or she interprets the role and responsibility of representing the Cal Poly faculty as a member of the ACTCSP.

B. A nominating petition (including the statement from A) signed by a minimum of twenty (20) and maximum of thirty (30) members of the Faculty eligible to vote in this election. No more than five (5) signatures can come from the nominee's Department and at least five (5) signatures must be from faculty in a college/PCS other than the nominee's college/PCS. Eligible signatories may not sign a nomination petition for more than one candidate without rendering their signature ineligible.

5. At the request of the Office of the Chancellor to begin the election process for faculty representation, the Academic Senate Chair will make the call for nominations allowing for a nomination period of one week.

6. The Academic Senate Chair will also make the arrangements for the voting process, allowing for a voting period of one week.

7. The two candidates (from different colleges/PCS) with the highest number of votes shall be the faculty representatives to the (ACTCSP). If there are significant time constraints, a tie vote will be decided by the Academic Senate Chair. If time does allow, run-off elections will be conducted to deal with a tie vote. The Academic Senate Chair will not vote in the election.
Rationale for 3(A-C): All three representatives should be from different colleges from each other so that Cal Poly faculty has the broadest possible range of representation given the constraints of the BOT policy. The purpose of the at-large position is to encourage the academic community to think in terms of electing the best candidates.

Rationale for 4(A): Requiring a statement of how a nominee would serve Cal Poly faculty on the ACTCSP will help faculty determine who is most likely to represent not only the interests of his or her department and college/PCS, but also the university more broadly.

Rationale for 4(B): Requiring that a nominee seek support outside of his or her department and college/PCS helps to ensure that our representatives are regarded by colleagues from across the campus as responsible representatives of Cal Poly faculty.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: December 27 2009
Revised: January 5 2010
Revised: April 6 2010
The Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents (BOT Policy) specifies that in addition to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of President established by the Office of the Chancellor, an Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) serves as one of the consultative groups in the selection of campus Presidents. Among the members of the ACTCSP is the Chair of the Academic Senate and two (2) "faculty representatives elected by the faculty" (http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/PresidentialSearch.shtml).

The nomination and election of the two faculty representatives to the ACTCSP shall be by and from those members of the General Faculty as defined by the Constitution of the Faculty (Article 1).

In order to provide the fullest possible representation of the colleges given the constraints of the BOT Policy, the combination of the two faculty representatives plus the Chair of the Academic Senate shall all come from separate colleges. Together the three shall have the following college affiliations:

A. One representative from either CLA or CSM.
B. One representative from CAFES, CAED, CENG, OCOB.
C. The second elected position will be an at large position. It will go to the nominee who receives the next highest votes and is not faculty from either the college of the Senate Chair or the first elected person.
D. In the event that one of the two elected representatives is unable to serve at any time during the search, the nominee who received the next highest number of votes in the election according to the specifications in 3 (including 3A-C) will serve in his or her stead.

To become a nominee for one of the two representative positions, an eligible member of the faculty must submit to the Chair of the Academic Senate the following:

A. A statement not to exceed 200 words indicating how he or she interprets the role and responsibility of representing the Cal Poly faculty as a member of the ACTCSP.
B. A nominating petition (including the statement from A) signed by twenty (20) members of the Faculty eligible to vote in this election. No more than five (5) signatures can come from the nominee's Department and at least five (5) signatures must be from faculty in a college other than the nominee's college. Eligible signatories may not sign nomination petitions for more than one candidate without rendering all petitions he or she has signed ineligible.

The call for nominations will be made on January 6, 2010 and the nomination period shall end at noon on January 13, 2010.
5. Ballots to elect the two faculty representatives along with each candidate's statement shall be distributed on January 14, 2010. The ballots shall contain the names of all qualified nominees, and voters will vote for two. Completed ballots must be received by the Academic Senate Office by noon on January 21, 2010 (Building 38, Room 143).

6. The two candidates with the highest number of votes (from different colleges) shall be the faculty representatives to the (ACTCSP). Due to time constraints, a tie vote will be decided by the Academic Senate Chair. Consequently, the Academic Senate Chair will not vote in the election.

Rationale for 3(A-C): All three representatives should be from different colleges from each other so that Cal Poly faculty has the broadest possible range of representation given the constraints of the BOT policy. The purpose of the at large position is to encourage the academic community to think in terms of electing the best candidates.

Rationale for 4(A): Requiring a statement of how a nominee would serve Cal Poly faculty on the ACTCSP will help faculty determine who is most likely to represent not only the interests of his or her department and college, but also the university more broadly.

Rationale for 4(B): Requiring that a nominee seek support outside of his or her department and college helps to ensure that our representatives are regarded by colleagues from across the campus as responsible representatives of Cal Poly faculty.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
December 11, 2010
WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly conducts its meetings in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order, and

WHEREAS, The protocol for CSU Academic Senates as well as the statewide Academic Senate is to submit an item in the form of a written resolution which is then deliberated over two meetings as a first and second reading; and

WHEREAS, First and second readings allow for reflective consideration of issues brought before the Senate; and

WHEREAS, Robert's Rules of Order does not address the deliberative process for first and second readings; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the following guidelines be used by the Academic Senate for first reading items:

• a first reading is a time for suggestions to be made to a resolution for its improvement. The resolution still belongs to its author and is not yet amendable

• a motion to suspend the rules may be used to move time-sensitive resolutions to second reading at the same meeting (a motion to suspend the rules is will be debatable in this case). Items cannot be moved to a second reading without compelling reason (the Senate Chair determines whether a reason is “compelling;” the Chair’s ruling can be overruled by the body)

• if a matter is clearly noncontroversial, time may be saved by asking for unanimous consent rather than making a formal motion to suspend the rules

• the resolution may be moved to a second reading at a future meeting; and

be it further
RESOLVED: That the following guidelines be used by the Academic Senate for second reading items:

- the motion to adopt the resolution must be moved and seconded before debate ensues. It then belongs to the body and may be amended
- documents attached to a resolution are not amendable
- amendments of one sentence or more must be made in writing and submitted to the Senate in advance; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Article V, paragraph D, of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be added to include the following provision:

First reading: FIRST READING IS A TIME FOR SUGGESTIONS TO BE MADE TO A RESOLUTION FOR ITS IMPROVEMENT. THE RESOLUTION STILL BELONGS TO ITS AUTHOR AND IS NOT YET AMENDABLE.

Voting on substantive resolutions (i.e., those involving University policy or those in which the Senate takes a position on an issue) takes place in two stages: first reading and second reading. In first reading, the resolution is introduced and suggestions for improvement or clarification are in order in first reading, but not amendments. The first reading of a resolution is concluded if (1) there is no one remaining who wishes to speak on the resolution, (2) a motion to close debate is passed (requires a two-thirds vote), or a motion is approved to move the resolution to second reading (requires a two-thirds vote, is debatable, and requires a compelling reason [determined by the Senate Chair, can be overruled by the body]). If a matter is noncontroversial, rather than a motion to suspend the rules, unanimous consent can be given by the body.

Second reading: THE MOTION TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION MUST BE MOVED AND SECONDED BEFORE DEBATE ENSUES. IT THEN BELONGS TO THE BODY AND MAY BE AMENDED. DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO A RESOLUTION ARE NOT AMENDABLE. Voting on substantive resolutions shall take place only after a second reading of the resolution at a meeting subsequent to the meeting at which it was first introduced, except that the Academic Senate, by two-thirds vote of the senators present, may waive this requirement. After the motion has been moved and seconded, amendments may be presented for action by the Senate. Amendments of one sentence or more must be made in writing and submitted to the Academic Senate office in advance. Documents attached to a resolution are not amendable.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 13 2009
Revised: October 13 2009
Revised: November 17 2009
Revised: March 9 2010
RESOLUTION ON PRIVATE DONORS

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate support and endorse the ASCSU “Resolution on Private Donors’ Respect for Academic Freedom” (AS-2936-10/FA attached); and be it further;

5 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate request that the President, Provost, the Vice-President for Advancement, deans, and department chairs/heads communicate the principles of academic freedom and the faculty’s autonomy in curricular and educational policies to private donors.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: March 22 2010
Revised: April 6 2010
Resolution on Private Donors' Respect for Academic Freedom

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) strongly reaffirm its commitment to academic freedom of the faculty and "the protection of freedom of inquiry, research, expression and teaching both inside and beyond the classroom" (AS-2675-04/FA - November 11-12, 2004); and be it further

2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU reaffirm that decisions affecting the curriculum and the selection of the faculty for academic programs are under the purview of campus faculty (AS-2822-07/FA); and be it further

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU deplore attempts by private donors to pressure local administrations to intervene in faculty’s academic decisions and activities inside and beyond the classroom based upon donors’ political and economic views and interests; and be it further

4. RESOLVED: That ASCSU request that the Chancellor's Office and campus administrations craft disclaimers to inform donors and university personnel with whom they deal that donors' financial support of the academic enterprise does not convey a right to inject personal or political beliefs to influence the academic content delivered; and be it further,

5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the Board of Trustees, Campus Presidents, Vice Presidents for Advancement and Public Affairs, and Campus Senate Chairs.
RATIONALE: Seeking private funding has become an important way of supplementing the dwindling state support for the higher education. Some of the non-academic organizations which donate to CSU programs are not familiar with, nor respectful of, the principle of academic freedom as the cornerstone of the university life. A recent and illustrative incident at one CSU campus has raised concern that donors may be attempting to exert pressure to influence invitations to controversial speakers and to affect curricular decisions. (See Los Angeles Times, October 14, 2009; San Luis Obispo Tribune, January 10, 2010) In the absence of clear guidelines for the advancement staff to firmly communicate with the donors the principle of non-intervention in faculty’s educational decisions, we will run the risk of outside pressure on our faculty to change the content of their educational programs inside and beyond the classroom.

Pass without dissent
RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ACADEMIC SENATE
CURRICULUM APPEALS COMMITTEE

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached proposal for the establishment of
an Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and
2009-10 GE Task Force
Date: March 29 2010
Revised: April 5 2010
Revised: April 6 2010
Curriculum Proposal Appeals Process: Curriculum Appeals Committee
(April 6 2010)

The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) and the 2009-2010 General Education (GE) Task Force have identified a need to develop a new appeals process for handling disputes about curriculum proposals. In the Office of the Registrar Curriculum Handbook, under the heading “Academic Senate” in the “Curriculum Roles and Responsibilities” section, the current appeals process is described thus:

All catalog proposals, except new degree programs, appear on the Senate agenda by college as consent items. Senators are given three weeks notice of the consent items and are expected to review the summaries posted on the Office of the Registrar website. Issues, concerns, and questions regarding curriculum proposals are directed to the chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee by one week before the Senate meeting. If the concern is strong enough, any senator may request an item be removed from the consent agenda no later than one week before the meeting. Items removed from the consent agenda will be placed on a first and second agenda cycle, with the first reading being the meeting of the consent agenda. The chair of the Curriculum Committee will invite representatives from the concerned departments to be present at the meetings where their proposals will be discussed. Items not removed from the consent agenda are considered approved on the meeting date of the consent agenda. (http://www.ess.calpoly.edu/records/curric-handbook/curric-roles-respons.html#ASCC)

The ASCC and the GE Task Force believe that when there are disputes about curriculum proposals that cannot be resolved prior to Academic Senate meetings, there should be debate on the Senate floor concerning the disputed curriculum proposals. However, the ASCC and GE Task Force also believe that it is unsatisfactory to place curriculum proposals pulled from the consent agenda on a first and second agenda cycle. Placing them on a first and second agenda cycle subjects a curriculum proposal that has been vetted at several levels, from the department all the way to Academic Senate committee(s), to an up or down vote on the Academic Senate floor. The curriculum committees at all levels spend considerable time developing an understanding of proposed curriculum in all of its details. The committees are obligated to grasp the ramifications and value of approving proposed curriculum within any major or minor program that may be affected by it. Acquiring such knowledge of individual curriculum proposals in the first and second reading cycle would be extremely time consuming and hence, unlikely.

Instead of placing pulled curriculum proposals on the first and second agenda cycle, the ASCC and GE Task Force call for the establishment of a new committee whose membership is limited to three in total, called the “Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee” (ASCAC). The ASCAC is charged with adjudicating in a timely manner over curriculum proposals pulled from the consent agenda. In fulfilling its charge, the ASCAC would be required to understand the nature of disputes concerning pulled curriculum proposals. The ASCAC would approve, disapprove, or return a curriculum proposal to committee (returned to committee at any level, as deemed appropriate).

Members on the ASCAC will need to be knowledgeable about the curriculum as a whole so that they are nimble enough to understand disputed curriculum proposals in the context of major and minor affected programs. Consequently, membership is limited to faculty with previously demonstrated overview curricular knowledge. Eligible faculty for membership will be appointed by the Academic Senate
Executive Committee for one year terms or partial year terms. Eligible faculty include at least two members from “List 1” and at least one member from List 2:

List 1:
- Former Academic Senate Chairs
- Former Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Chairs
- Former members of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee who served for a minimum of two catalog cycles

List 2:
- Former GE Directors/Chairs
- Former GE Committee/Board members who served for a minimum of two catalog cycles*

Note that no member of the ASCAC can be actively serving in any of the capacities listed in “List 1” and “List 2” at the same time s/he is serving on the ASCAC.

Should the Academic Senate agree to the establishment of the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee, the description of the proposed curriculum proposal appeals process in the Curriculum Handbook, under the heading “Academic Senate” in the “Curriculum Roles and Responsibilities” section, would read:

All curriculum proposals, except new degree programs, appear on the Academic Senate agenda by college as consent items. Senators are given three weeks notice of the consent items and are expected to review the summaries posted on the Office of the Registrar website. Issues, concerns, and questions regarding curriculum proposals are directed to the chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee by one week before the Senate meeting. If the concern is strong enough, any senator may request an item be removed from the consent agenda no later than one week before the meeting. Items removed from the consent agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as discussion items. The Senate Chair (or designee) will invite representatives from the concerned departments and the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed. It is recommended that the Senate Chair allow the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee freedom to ask questions at will, without needing to be on the speakers list. Following discussion in the Senate, the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee will make the final decision to approve, disapprove, or return the items to committee (at any level) for further development. Items not removed from the consent agenda are considered approved on the meeting date of the consent agenda.

* Since at any given time there may not be enough full time faculty who are eligible to serve on the committee, FERPs who satisfy any of the categories on List 1 or List 2 are also eligible to serve on the ASCAC.

** This category is not intended to include members of GE area committees.