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**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: May 7, 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>ASCI 477 Senior Project – Research Experience in Animal Science (3) supv</td>
<td>Approved 4/22/10</td>
<td>May 25 On Consent Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 -Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCI 478 Senior Project – Advanced Internship Experience in Animal Science (3) supv</td>
<td>Approved 4/22/10</td>
<td>May 25 On Consent Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 -Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON 312 Intermediate Microeconomics II (4) lec</td>
<td>Approved 4/22/10</td>
<td>May 25 On Consent Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2011 -Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION ON EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES, POLICY & ETHICS CENTER (ETPEC)

1 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the attached proposal for establishment of the Emerging Technologies, Policy & Ethics Center (ETPEC).

Proposed by: Colleges of Liberal Arts and Engineering
Date: April 14 2010
Proposal Summary:
Emerging Technologies, Policy & Ethics Center

Prepared on: April 13, 2010

Submitted by:
Patrick Lin, Ph.D. – College of Liberal Arts, Philosophy Department
George Bekey, Ph.D. – College of Engineering, Dean's Office
Shelley L. Hurt, Ph.D. – College of Liberal Arts, Political Science Department

Submitted to:
Rachel Fernflores, Ph.D – Chair, Academic Senate

Overview

“Will we develop monster technologies before cage technologies, or after? Some monsters, once loosed, cannot be caged.”

– Dr. Eric Drexler, Engines of Creation: The Coming Era of Nanotechnology (1986)

We propose to create a Emerging Technologies, Policy & Ethics Center (ETPEC), a non-partisan and highly interdisciplinary research and education center, based on the momentum and success of our Ethics + Emerging Sciences Group (EESG): http://ethics.calpoly.edu.

Researchers are rapidly developing new technologies—from nanotechnology to neuroscience—under significant pressure to commercialize or militarize such innovations. Yet, by definition, we do not have a firm grasp of how these emerging capabilities might benefit society as well as cause

1 The name of our center may change prior to its formal establishment, in which case the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs will approve of any changes.
unintended, and potentially harmful or disruptive, effects. Our center would raise and engage key societal, ethical, and policy questions related to emerging technologies, helping to guide their responsible use.

Purpose

The mission of our proposed center is to leverage Cal Poly's unique strengths—e.g., science and technology leadership, growing humanities programs, central location in California—to promote academic and public discourse on the ethical, policy, and security implications of emerging areas of science and technology.

We envision a world in which new, world-changing technologies are not created in a vacuum—as they largely are now—but instead are developed proactively in partnership with stakeholders throughout society to minimize disruption and harm, as well as to maximize benefits.

Rationale

Our Ethics + Emerging Sciences Group (EESG) continues to expand its activities, outgrowing the scope and organizational support of any single department. As we explain in this proposal, we believe that establishing a formal center will benefit Cal Poly and the broader community in several critical ways, which include:

- Building bridges among traditionally and self-isolated colleges and departments
- Enhancing professional development opportunities for faculty
- Forging links with industry, non-profits, and the surrounding community
- Providing an identifiable campus entity for practitioners
- Fostering interdisciplinary work
- Aiding in obtaining external support
- Enriching the undergraduate and graduate instructional programs.

 Appropriately for a polytechnic university, we are focusing on new or emerging technologies—as distinct from established ones, such as Internet technologies or cloning—because there is a greater ethics and policy gap with emerging technologies, which urgently needs to be filled. This focus also serves to differentiate us from other ethics and policy centers, some of which may dabble in emerging technologies, but very few are focused on them. Further, this focus aligns with funding opportunities and captures public imagination and interest.

To the extent that the EESG already contributes towards enlivening many, if not all, elements of Cal Poly's mission, we expect that ETPEC will enhance the broader institutional mission.
Momentum

As the basis for ETPEC, the Ethics + Emerging Sciences Group (EESG) has its roots outside of Cal Poly, organically growing from The Nanoethics Group—a non-partisan research group that Dr. Patrick Lin co-founded in 2003 (www.nanoethics.org). The latter is now one of several research clusters of the EESG, which is also a parent to: Robot Ethics Group (www.robotethics.com), Human Enhancement Ethics Group (www.humanenhance.com), and others in the process of formation.

Cal Poly is credited for its support of our projects, which include: a nanoethics anthology (Springer, 2008), a nanoethics monograph (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), an ethics and policy report on autonomous military robotics (funded by US DoD/Office of Naval Research, 2008), an ethics and policy report on human enhancement technologies (funded by US National Science Foundation, 2009), and several other publications. We are in the process of developing a robot-ethics anthology (MIT Press, under contract), the first of its kind.

In the last few years, our core faculty members have won several external grants and supporting fellowships, ranging from $10,000 to $300,000, some of which resulted in the above-mentioned publications. Pending projects include two NSF grants currently under review (for $300,000 in robot ethics and $400,000 in geoengineering policy) and other funding proposals in progress.

Our broader, public outreach activities include articles and interviews in popular media (Popular Mechanics, Forbes, Wired, BBC Focus, London Times, The Christian Science Monitor, etc.), as well as development of the above-listed websites. In March 2009, we co-organized a successful conference on human enhancement ethics in Michigan, with invited speakers from Oxford, Yale, Indiana Univ., Carnegie Mellon, IBM, General Dynamics, and other organizations. In early 2009, we launched the Technology & Ethics Lecture Series, which has been well attended—standing room only for the last two events, with the most recent event drawing over 200 attendees. This lecture series tackles such topics as research ethics, cyberweapons, Facebook, and neuroscience.

People

The EESG has already been operating as a highly interdisciplinary team, giving rise to unique synergies. We expect to continue this teamwork with ETPEC and propose the following leadership roles:

- Director: Patrick Lin, Ph.D. (CLA/Philosophy)
- Associate Director: George Bekey, Ph.D. (CENG/Dean's Office)
• Associate Director: **Shelley L. Hurt, Ph.D.** (CLA/Political Science).

Currently the director of EESG and the proposed director for ETPEC, Dr. Patrick Lin is an assistant professor in the philosophy department. We also propose to have two associate directors, representing both the College of Engineering and the College of Liberal Arts: Prof. George Bekey (CENG Dean’s Office; professor emeritus at USC), and Dr. Shelley L. Hurt (political science). In the following, we provide brief biosketches for these personnel:

**Patrick Lin** is the director of the Ethics + Emerging Sciences Group. At Cal Poly, he has led research efforts that culminated in two major reports: *Autonomous Military Robotics: Risk, Ethics, and Design* (funded by the US Dept. of Defense/Navy, 2008) and *Ethics of Human Enhancement: 25 Questions & Answers* (funded by the US National Science Foundation, 2009). He has published several books and papers in the field of technology ethics, including a new monograph *What Is Nanotechnology and Why Does It Matter?: From Science to Ethics* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010) and a forthcoming anthology *Robot Ethics: The Social and Ethical Implication of Robotics* (MIT Press, in preparation). Dr. Lin earned his BA from University of California at Berkeley, MA and PhD from University of California at Santa Barbara, and completed a three-year post-doctoral appointment at Dartmouth College. He is currently an assistant professor in Cal Poly’s philosophy department and an ethics fellow at the US Naval Academy.

**George Bekey** is a research scholar-in-residence at Cal Poly, distinguished adjunct professor of engineering, and special consultant to the CENG Dean, Mohammad Noori. As professor emeritus at University of Southern California (Department of Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, and Biomedical Engineering), he founded the school’s robotics lab. Over the last two decades, he has won more than $7.5M in grants to fund his leading-edge research. Prof. Bekey has authored scores of papers on robotics, including *Autonomous Robots: From Biological Inspiration to Implementation and Control* (MIT Press, 2005). He is a member of the National Academy of Engineering and the recipient of a number of other honors and awards. He earned his BS from UC Berkeley and MS and PhD from UCLA.

**Shelley L. Hurt** is assistant professor of political science at Cal Poly. Her dissertation, “Science, Power, and the State: US Foreign Policy, Intellectual Property Law, and the Origins of Agricultural Biotechnology, 1969-1994” has recently been nominated for the Virginia M. Walsh Award for Best Dissertation at the American Political Science Association. She has received numerous awards and fellowships for and in support of her doctoral research from respected institutions such as University of Virginia, Dartmouth College, and the New School for Social Research. Dr. Hurt is currently a co-PI on a project about the emergence of public-private partnerships at home and abroad, which is expected to culminate in an edited volume in early 2011. Among other works in technology policy, she is currently co-authoring a book on the American military’s role on technological innovation and economic growth. Dr. Hurt earned her BA in political science from UC Berkeley and her MA and PhD in political science from the New School for Social Research.
Our work has involved faculty from many other Cal Poly departments, including: military science, computer science, ethnic studies, agribusiness, and others. We have over 50 faculty on our news-distribution list, as a sign of wide interest in our work. We have employed two student assistants to help with our projects and have included budgets for more student researchers in our funding proposals under review.

Outside of Cal Poly, we continue to collaborate with experts from other universities and organizations, including: Arizona State Univ., The Australian National Univ. (Australia), Carnegie Mellon Univ., Case Western Reserve Univ., Centre d’Etudes et de Recherches Internationales (France), Copenhagen Business School (Denmark), Dartmouth College, Delft Univ. of Technology (The Netherlands), Georgia Institute of Technology, Indiana Univ. at Bloomington, Oxford Univ. (UK), Nagoya Univ. (Japan), Stanford Univ., UC Santa Cruz, University of Delaware, University of Southern California, Univ. of Sheffield (UK), University of Sydney (Australia), University of Virginia, US Naval Academy, Western Michigan Univ., Yale, York Univ. (Canada), and many others in the US and internationally. These academic ties also will be valuable to other Cal Poly faculty and students, as ETPEC begins its work.

Projects

In addition to project already underway as mentioned above, ETPEC will continue and extend the work of EESG, which includes the myriad activities expected from a research and education center:

- Academic publications, incl. journal papers, reports, books
- Seeking external funding for research and other deliverables
- Organizing conferences on leading-edge issues
- Hosting a lecture series for students, faculty, staff, and the local community
- Developing university-level courses
- Writing also for public audiences, incl. blogs, op-eds, etc.
- Engaging K-12 and other audiences
- Creating websites that serve as public information portals
- Advising organizations on policy and related issues
- And more.

While we will remain a non-partisan group, we may participate in public policy as appropriate, as we have done in the past. For instance, Dr. Shelley L. Hurt has presented research findings at a conference on détente, sponsored by the Office of the Historian at the US Department of State.

---

With the retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) process in mind for faculty, especially junior faculty, the priority of these activities will be aligned with RPT requirements—generally falling into the category of professional development, service, or teaching.
Dr. Patrick Lin has advised high-profile organizations, such as the President’s Council for Bioethics, American Bar Association, and California's Environmental Protection Agency, on nanotechnology ethics and regulations, and he has recently been asked to testify before Congress on policy and ethics related to military robotics (details to be determined). By virtue of his fellowship at the US Naval Academy, Dr. Lin is part of a consortium on military technologies and policy (CETMONS: Consortium for Emerging Technologies, Military Operations, and National Security), composed of ethics and engineering centers at the Naval Academy, Arizona State Univ., Case Western Reserve Univ., and Georgia Tech. The consortium intends to engage policymakers and seek funding for related projects. (Note: If we were a center now, Cal Poly could formally be a part of this consortium and play a more visible role, including directly receiving funding from secured sources.)

Currently, Dr. Patrick Lin and colleagues are developing a course on robot ethics and discussing an interdisciplinary course on nanoethics; and Dr. Shelley L. Hurt has taught the “International Organizations and Law” course in the Winter 2010 quarter and is teaching “Technology and Policy” in the Spring 2010 quarter—both involving arms control, human rights, and intellectual property rights, all through the lens of emerging sciences and technologies.

With respect to the research areas we are engaging, they are currently:

- Nanotechnology
- Biotechnology
- Human enhancement technologies
- Robotics
- Geoengineering
- Military technologies, including cyberwarfare.

We also have interests in many other fields and expect to engage those fields, which include:

- Virtual reality
- Artificial intelligence
- Space development
- Neuroscience
- Synthetic biology
- And others.

**Sustainability**

We expect the majority of our operating budget to come from external grants, which will fund specific projects. Previously, we were successful on a pair of DoD/Office of Naval Research (C3RP) grants totaling over $90,000 to study issues in military robotics. Currently, we have two (2) NSF grants under review: a $300,000 proposal for work in robot ethics, and a $400,000 collaborative
proposal (with Western Michigan Univ.) for a study in geoengineering policy. In the last review cycle for the NSF’s Science, Technology, and Society funding program, our $400,000 collaborative proposal (with USC) qualified for funding—with two “Excellent” ratings, two “Very Good”, and one “Good” — but was ultimately not funded given program budget limitations; so we are encouraged that our future proposals will be highly competitive.

Separately, Dr. Patrick Lin led efforts on a successful NSF award of approximately $250,000 (collaborative project between Dartmouth College and Western Michigan Univ.) for a study in nanotechnology and human enhancement ethics—one of the first awards, if not the first, of its size for a specific ethics project; and his US Naval Academy fellowship includes a $10,000+ budget for research and travel.

Dr. Shelley L. Hurt’s grants include a Venture Capital Fund grant from the International Studies Association of $25,000 and a France-Berkeley Fund grant of $10,000 from the University of California, both in collaboration with Dr. Ronnie Lipschutz of UC Santa Cruz.

Prof. George Bekey has been involved with project awards totaling over $7.5M in the last 20 years alone, including an NSF award at Cal Poly for nearly $300,000, under the Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) program.

The ETPEC leadership team plans to submit a steady flow of proposals to other grant programs in order to help fund the center’s intellectual and programmatic goals. For instance, we already have inquiries into or conversations started with Google Foundation, Hewlett Foundation, Kavli Foundation, and others to support both specific projects as well as the center at large.

Without physical facilities to rent or equipment to pay for, our fiscal needs are modest and can be met with project-specific grant funding, as has been the case in previous years. However, with formal center status, we would be able to recover a sizable percentage of indirect costs from our grant-funded projects, giving us a cushion for administrative expenses and smaller, unfunded initiatives.

Organization

The center director will report to the Dean of Research and Graduate Programs and will be advised by an Executive Committee—which includes the Deans of the College of Liberal Arts as well as the College of Engineering— and an External Advisory Board.

With ETPEC as the parent organization, we plan to develop research clusters around our various interests, as well as the technical and policy expertise we have available in and outside of Cal Poly. Indeed, several of these clusters already exist in various stages of development, such as the
Nanoethics Group, Robot Ethics Group, and Human Enhancement Ethics Group. Thus, we plan to build out these and other groups to form research clusters in:

- Nanotechnology
- Human enhancement
- Geoengineering
- Cybersecurity
- Artificial intelligence
- Neuroscience
- Robotics
- Biotechnology
- Military technologies
- Virtual reality
- Space development
- Synthetic biology
- Others

Note: Our budget, bylaws, organizational chart, and other details are available upon request. These items are omitted here for length considerations.

**Conclusion**

From conversations with senior administrators, deans, faculty, students, and other stakeholders, we believe there is strong interest for our center. Our Emerging Technologies, Policy, and Ethics Center (ETPEC) would be positioned to make dynamic contributions to the university, San Luis Obispo county, as well as national and international security. Science and technology are developing today at an ever-rapid pace, while the capacity of societies and governments to assess risk and opportunities is increasingly difficult. In light of these challenges at home and abroad, ETPEC can help Cal Poly's students, faculty, and international community to confront some of the most important and cutting-edge issues of our time. As a center at a premier and comprehensive polytechnic university, ETPEC will serve as a critical hub in bridging disciplinary divides—integrating ethics, policy, and national security dimensions of emerging sciences and technologies.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

RESOLUTION ON MANDATORY EARLY START PROGRAMS

Background:
The CSU Board of Trustees has proposed Mandatory Early Start Programs beginning in the summer of 2012. All incoming students deficient in English and/or mathematics will be required to begin making up those deficiencies before matriculation.

Funding for these summer remediation courses is still unclear. The Board of Trustees has indicated that there will be no additional funding provided for this instruction.

The Academic Senate of the CSU and the English Council of the CSU have opposed implementation of the Mandatory Early Start Programs.

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees has proposed Mandatory Early Start Programs beginning in the summer of 2012; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of the CSU has identified the following concerns regarding the Mandatory Early Start Programs that have been proposed by the CSU Board of Trustees (AS-2895-09/APEP/AA):

- the (1) unilateral implementation by campuses which are “already moving toward requiring”1 FTF to engage in remediation and (2) doing so prior to Fall 2009 enrollment
- the legality of denying admission to fully qualified FTF;
- the limitation of access to economically disadvantaged students;
- the financial aid implications for students;
- the potential hardship for out-of-area students;
- the shift of mandatory instruction to a non-traditional instructional session;
- the presumed desirability of identifying a single or limited number of “early start” programs for the CSU system;
- the paucity of evidence-based, longitudinal data on the effectiveness and social impact of “early start” programs; and

WHEREAS, The Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Exam and the English Placement Test (EPT) were originally designed as placement instruments; and

WHEREAS, Many campuses, including Cal Poly, have very effective remediation programs; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly oppose the implementation of “early start” programs as a pre-condition for enrollment at the Cal Poly campus; and be it
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly urge that prior to any implementation the CSU ensure that serious attention be paid to the financial consequences—both to campuses and to individual students—resulting from the various “early start” approaches; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly oppose the use of tests, such as the ELM and the EPT, to either grant or deny otherwise qualified first-time freshmen (FTF) admission to Cal Poly; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly urge that Cal Poly faculty be fully engaged in any planning, teaching, and evaluating of Cal Poly “early start” programs; and be it further

RESOLVED: That such “early start” programs supplement but not supplant already existing, successful models of proficiency attainment at Cal Poly and other campuses; and be it further

RESOLVED: That success of the programs themselves be assessed over time to determine their effects upon such factors as retention rates and progress toward degree before the CSU considers mandating adoption of any “early-start” model system-wide; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, the Chair of the Academic Senate of the CSU, campus Presidents, Provosts, and Academic Senate Chairs, the Chair of the English Council of the CSU, and the Chair of the Mathematics Council of the CSU.

Proposed by: Cal Poly English Department and Cal Poly Mathematics Department

Date: May 4 2010
RESOLVED: The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) recognizes the value of diverse campus approaches to moving fully qualified first-time freshmen (FTF) who require additional skill acquisition (remediation) in English or mathematics to achieve proficiency either prior to, or during, their first year of enrollment; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU oppose the implementation of “early start” programs as a pre-condition for enrollment at any CSU campus until such time as a number of concerns, including but not limited to:

- the (1) unilateral implementation by campuses which are “already moving toward requiring”, FTF to engage in remediation and (2) doing so prior to Fall 2009 enrollment;
- the legality of denying admission to fully qualified FTF;
- the limitation of access to economically disadvantaged students;
- the financial aid implications for students;
- the potential hardship for out-of-area students;
- the shift of mandatory instruction to a non-traditional instructional session;
- the presumed desirability of identifying a single or limited number of “early start” programs for the CSU system;
- the paucity of evidence-based, longitudinal data on the effectiveness and social impact of “early start” programs;

are addressed in the context of shared governance at both the local and systemwide levels; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the CSU Board of Trustees, the CSU Office of the Chancellor, and campuses of the CSU, to explore other means to improve FTF proficiency, including but not limited to Directed Self Placement and credit-bearing stretch courses; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That this resolution be sent to the following CSU entities: the Board of Trustees, the Office of the Chancellor, campus Presidents, Provosts and Senate Chairs, the Chair of the English Council of the CSU, and the Chair of the Mathematics Council of the CSU.
RATIONALE: The Board of Trustees of the CSU has an on-going commitment to require all fully eligible and admitted First Time Freshmen (FTF) to demonstrate college level proficiency in both English and mathematics no later than the end of their freshman year. The CSU has achieved this goal to a roughly 85% compliance rate but continues to seek more efficient approaches and identify best practices to assist students in their efforts.

Faculty leadership has led campuses to invest in a number of “early start” programs to assist students in their efforts to demonstrate proficiency before the start of their freshman year. However, Agenda Item 3 of the Committee on Education Policy for the Board of Trustees’ May 12-13, 2009 meeting features a resolution focusing on “Proficiency in English and Mathematics Before the First Year.” The resolution authorizes the pilot testing of “early start” programs, including those considering mandatory involvement of FTF students anticipating matriculation in the fall of 2009, who have not demonstrated readiness for college work in either mathematics or English, or both. The resolution requires the CSU, by March of 2010, to use the reported results of these pilot tests to establish policies requiring a full-scale implementation of such pre-matriculation programs with a timetable throughout the CSU.

Approved – May 7-8, 2009
RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ACADEMIC SENATE GENERAL EDUCATION GOVERNANCE BOARD

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached proposal for the establishment of an Academic Senate General Education Governance Board.

Proposed by: Academic Senate 2009-10 GE Task Force
Date: May 04 2010
Revised: May 11 2010
Academic Senate General Education Governing Board  
(May 11 2010)

Responsibility:
Cal Poly's general education (GE) program is the administrative responsibility of the Academic Senate General Education Governing Board (GEGB). GEGB should function like a department with a deep sense of interest and responsibility for overseeing and implementing the GE program.

Charge:
The GEGB is responsible for leading and developing a visionary, high quality GE program that enriches the specialized knowledge acquired in a major program with foundational and integrative understandings of its scientific, humanistic, artistic, and technological contexts. In so doing, the GEGB is responsible for fostering and refining a vision of general education that is responsive to statewide, national, and international values in general education, local campus interests and emphases, and opportunities for positive change.

Duties of GEGB:
The GEGB assists the GEGB Chair in shaping the future and quality of the GE program. In so doing, the GEGB establishes the policies and principles that speak to the vision of the GE program as set out in the charge. Members must be proactive and responsive in reaching out to faculty, departments, and administrators in the University to develop GE curriculum.

Duties include:
1. Review and approve GE course proposals.
2. Place GE curriculum proposals on the AcademicSenate consent agenda after consultation with the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee.
3. Act on internal and external petitions regarding GE requirements.
4. Manage articulation and transfer issues.
5. Engage in appropriate assessment activities. Be proactive and responsive to the results of assessment activities.
6. Conduct a GE academic program review on the same cycle as other programs. Findings will be presented to the college deans and the Academic Senate. The GEGB needs to be proactive and responsive to the recommendations that result from academic program review.

Duties of GEGB Chair:
The GEGB Chair will lead the GEGB in the development of the vision of GE and is accountable for making progress toward fulfillment of the GE vision. The GEGB Chair maintains strong oversight of the GE program for quality control at every level. He or she is a constant advocate for a high quality GE program that exposes students to pedagogical experiences they need to be erudite and polymathic.
Duties include:

1. Be in regular communication and consultation with the GEGB.
2. Communicate with faculty and advisors to spread understanding of the GE program.
3. Be in regular communication and consultation with the college deans and the Provost about the GE needs of Cal Poly students.
4. Be in regular communication and consultation with the Academic Senate Chair and the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Chair.
5. Work collaboratively with the college deans, the Office of the Registrar, the GEGB, Academic Programs, and the departments to understand where the demand for courses is.
6. Work collaboratively with the college deans, the Provost, and the GEGB to understand resources.
7. Establish ad hoc committees if the GEGB Chair determines that ad hoc committees are needed, for instance for periodic GE assessment purposes or for program review.

Membership and Appointment Procedures of GEGB:

1. The GEGB will be comprised of two faculty members from CLA; two faculty members from CSM; one faculty member from each of the remaining colleges; one student; one member from Professional Consultative Services (PCS); and a GEGB Chair (all voting members, with the exception of the GEGB Chair, who has a tie breaking vote only).
2. The GEGB will also include one representative from the Office of the Registrar (ex officio, non-voting) and one representative from Academic Programs (ex officio, non-voting).
3. Faculty members and PCS representatives on the GEGB shall be members of the General Faculty, as defined in the Constitution of the Faculty.
4. The GEGB chair will serve four-year terms. The GEGB chair will be appointed by the Provost following a recommendation from the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the GEGB.
5. ASI representatives must be able to demonstrate developing expertise in at least one GE area. ASI representatives will be appointed by ASI for one-year terms.
6. All eligible voting members of the GEGB must be able to demonstrate expertise in at least one GE area. The GEGB chair must also be able to demonstrate extensive expertise in and experience with the GE program as a whole. In addition to demonstrable expertise regarding Cal Poly's GE program, all members should have knowledge of CSU GE standards and Title V.
7. GEGB members will serve three-year terms. Faculty members and PCS members on the GEGB will be appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee.
8. When ad hoc GE committees are deemed necessary, members should have expertise in the relevant GE areas.

Decisions made by the GEGB:

All GEGB curricula will be available for debate and discussion in the Academic Senate, just as all non-GE curricula are. Appeal processes of curricular decisions made by the
GEGB will follow Academic Senate curriculum appeals processes. The GEGB Chair should be involved with any changes to Academic Senate curriculum appeals processes.
RESOLUTION ON THE ACADEMIC SENATE POLICY AND
PROCEDURES FOR REORGANIZATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
AND ACADEMIC UNITS AND SUSPENSION OF PROGRAMS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the attached proposal for the Academic Senate
Policy and Procedures for Reorganization of Academic Programs and Academic
Units and Suspension of Programs.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Spring 2010 Mergers,
Suspension, and Reorganization Task Force
Date: May 4 2010
Academic Senate Policy and Procedures for
Reorganization of Academic Programs and
Academic Units and Suspension of Programs
(May 4 2010)

Policy Overview

Program or Unit Reorganization:
Reorganization of academic programs and academic units may result from regular program review, accreditation recommendations, resource and enrollment issues, or curricular considerations.

Reorganization of academic programs and units may include but is not limited to mergers, consolidations, divisions, separations or movements of either academic programs or units that affect how those programs or units are administered.

Program Suspension:
Suspension of an academic program may result from regular program review, accreditation recommendations, resource and enrollment issues, or a demonstrated need for faculty to review the curricular or administrative structure of the program.

Program suspension is not acceptable when the aim is program discontinuance. An academic program may not be suspended for a period of more than two full academic years. After this period the program is automatically reinstated unless a new proposal is submitted to either (a) continue the suspension for an additional two-year term or (b) discontinue the program.

Procedures

1. Initiation of Academic Program or Unit Reorganization or Program Suspension Proposals:

A proposal for the reorganization of academic programs or units, or suspension of an academic program, must be presented to the Provost and Vice Provost and the Academic Senate Chair by one or more of the following:

- A simple majority of the tenured and tenure track faculty of the affected program(s) or unit(s)
- The dean(s) of the college(s) involved in the academic programs or units to be reorganized, or programs to be suspended
- The Provost
- The President

1 Definitions:
A. Academic program: “An academic program is a structured grouping of coursework leading to a baccalaureate or graduate degree or to a teaching credential” (AS-700-10).
B. Academic unit: A department, school, college, or other administrative home for an academic program.
2. A proposal for the reorganization of an academic program or unit should be preceded by a full and open discussion with faculty members and staff in affected academic programs or units about the proposed changes. All proposals must include:

   A. A summary of the consultative procedures followed
   B. A summary of the three main reasons for the proposed changes

A proposal for the reorganization of an academic program or unit that is regarded to be non-contentious by the affected faculty, the Chair(s)/Head(s)/Director(s), and the appropriate administrators, only requires 2A and 2B, above. Non-contentious proposals will be reviewed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee on the earliest convenient date.

The Academic Senate Executive Committee will prepare a report either indicating agreement that the proposal is non-contentious or requiring a more detailed report. Proposals classified as non-contentious by the Academic Senate Executive Committee will be placed on the Academic Senate consent agenda along with the Academic Senate Executive Committee report. The Academic Senate will be notified of the consent agenda items. Consent agenda items resulting from this process will be subject to appeal by any senator. Pulled proposals will be placed on the next Academic Senate agenda as a business item in the first and second reading cycle.

A proposal for the reorganization of an academic program or unit that is regarded as contentious by affected faculty, Chair(s)/Head(s)/Director(s), appropriate administrators or the Academic Senate requires a detailed report that will include the following, in addition to 2A and 2B:

   C. A detailed account of the proposed administrative and curricular changes
   D. Compelling evidence to support the financial or academic benefits of any proposed reorganization or program suspension, relative to leaving the existing program or unit in place or unchanged.
   E. An explanation of the probable effects of the proposed changes relative to university-wide learning objectives, accreditation, and the university strategic plan
   F. A summary of the most recent program review and accreditation review, if applicable
   G. The number of students, the number of faculty at each rank, and the number of staff at each rank involved in the affected academic programs or units, and the most probable way(s) the proposed changes will affect them
   H. Student enrollment and application patterns for the academic program(s) or units during the previous five years, if applicable
   I. The means by which the affected students, faculty, and staff will be informed of the proposed changes
   J. An explanation as to how students currently enrolled in the programs or units will be accommodated until they complete the program
   K. If the proposal is submitted during the summer, a compelling explanation as to why it is being submitted during summer and not during the academic year
L. Acknowledgement of the proposal from the relevant dean(s) and relevant Chair(s)/Head(s)/Director(s)

3. Any proposal that is calling for program suspension will include all of 2A-L, and:

   M. An explanation as to why program suspension, not program discontinuance, is being proposed
   N. The date when the proposed program suspension would take effect, and the date when it is anticipated that the program will be reinstated
   O. A plan for reinstating the program when the suspension period ends
   P. A complete list of courses that will not be taught if the affected program is suspended
   Q. The changes that would be necessary in order to reinstate the program

4. Proposal Review:

Upon receipt of contentious proposal(s) to reorganize academic programs or units, or to suspend academic programs, the Academic Senate Chair will form an ad hoc committee comprised of one faculty member from each college (none of whom are members of affected programs or units), one student (who may be from one of the affected programs or units), and when possible, two faculty members from affected programs or units.

The charge of the ad hoc committee will be to review the proposed changes and provide a report with recommendations to the Academic Senate.

Proposal review periods are not to exceed twelve (12) weeks.

5. Twelve Week Review Timeline:

   Week One: Ad hoc committee formed
   Weeks Two-Five: Ad hoc committee begins reviewing proposal, consulting with dean(s), chair(s)/head(s)/director(s), members of the affected programs or units, students in proposed affected programs or units
   Week Six: Academic Senate hosts one public meeting, ad hoc committee in attendance, to discuss proposed changes
   Week Seven: Ad hoc committee prepares and presents written report with recommendations to Academic Senate Chair
   Week Eight: Academic Senate Executive Committee considers ad hoc committee report, recommendations, and if appropriate,\(^2\) agendizes report for full Academic Senate consideration
   Week Nine: Academic Senate considers ad hoc committee report as a business item, first reading
   Week Eleven: Academic Senate considers ad hoc committee report as a business item, second reading
   Week Twelve: Academic Senate Chair submits ad hoc committee report and Academic Senate decision to Provost/Vice Provost

\(^2\) During summer, the Academic Senate Executive Committee deliberates and legislates with the full weight of the Academic Senate (see Bylaws of the Academic Senate, VI.A.).