I. **Minutes:** Approval of minutes for the meetings of November 15 and November 29, 2011 (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:
   G. ASI:

IV. **Special Reports:**
    Mary Pedersen, Associate Vice Provost for Programs & Planning: report on program review—status of programs in process, summary information on reviewers, summary of the “Senior Project Project.”

V. **Consent Agenda:**

VI. **Business Item(s):**
   A. **Resolution on Course Outcomes/Objectives:** Derelian/Giberti, representatives of the WASC/Academic Senate Integrated Student Learning Work Group, second reading continued (pp. 6-9).
   B. **Resolution on Changes to the Academic Senate General Education (GE) Governing Board Policy:** Machamer, chair of the GE Governance Board, first reading (pp. 10-13).
   C. **Resolution on Direction of Expenditures for the CSU Online Initiative:** Griggs, chair of the Online Task Force, first reading (pp. 14-15).

VII. **Adjournment:**
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California 93407
ACADEMIC SENATE

MINUTES OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
Tuesday, November 15, 2011
UU220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: the minutes of October 4 and October 25 were approved as presented.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
B. President’s Office: none.
C. Provost: none.
D. Vice Provost for Student Affairs: none.
E. Statewide Senate: Foroohar reported that there is a high level of concern and frustration among statewide senators about top-down initiatives planned by the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Trustees with no meaningful consultation with the faculty. These initiatives include the Graduation Initiative, the Early Start Program, the SB 1440 (Star Act) community college transfer degree, and most recently the CSU on-line initiative. In response to the latest top-down action on the on-line initiative, the statewide senate unanimously approved a resolution “The Faculty Role and Campus Participation in the CSU On-line Initiative,” which resolved that “the ASCSU strongly assert that the best on-line programs develop from faculty working in a quality assurance structure which adheres to department, college, and university curricular review procedures ....” Another resolution “Early Faculty Involvement in California State University (CSU) Initiatives,” which was discussed as a first reading item and will return to the senate plenary for voting in January, states that “The pattern of announcing decisions and then asking for faculty help in implementing the initiatives is not what is meant by shared governance.” LoCascio reported that the statewide Academic Affairs Committee is writing a white paper on best practices for the CSU and on-line programs, which will be available on January 2012.
F. CFA Campus President: Thorncroft reported that at last week’s rally held on campus over 100 faculty members, staff and students participated.
G. ASI Representative: Tabrizi announced that the lease for Chase Bank in the University Union is for 5-years with a 5-year option to renew. The University Union Advisory Board will determine the fee structure for the new Rec Center.

IV. Special Reports: none.

V. Consent Agenda: approved as presented.
VI. Business Item(s):
A. **Resolution on Consent Agenda Review Duration for Curricular Proposals (Curriculum Committee):** Schaffner, chair of the Curriculum Committee presented this resolution, which recommends shortening the Consent Agenda notice time provided to senators from three weeks to two weeks. M/S/P to approve the resolution.

B. **Resolution on Course Outcomes/Objectives (WASC/Academic Senate Integrated Student Learning Work Group):** Giberti presented this resolution, which requests that all course learning outcomes/objectives be aligned to the program learning objectives, be approved by program faculty, communicated to students, and "publish" on course syllabus. Resolution will return as a second reading item.

VII. Discussion Item(s): none.

VIII. Adjournment: 4:48 pm

Submitted by,

[Signature]

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
I. Minutes: none.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Fernflores reminded the Senators that the celebration of Unny Menon’s life will be on December 2nd, in the ATL at 11.
B. President’s Office: Kinsley reported that she will begin a comprehensive review of the Campus Administrative Policies.
C. Provost: none.
D. Vice Provost for Student Affairs: none.
E. Statewide Senate: LoCascio reported that there is a rumor going around that campuses will be required to fund their own statewide senators, at an estimated cost of $10,000 per senator, because the CSU statewide is out of money.
F. CFA Campus President: Thorncroft reported that CFA has declared an impasse on contract negotiations. There are no further details at this time.
G. ASI Representative: Tabrizi reported that ASI held its first ASI Alumni Council two weeks ago. The UU Advisory Board has approved a mandatory fee of $36.00 a month per students for the new Rec Center; faculty and staff will have the option to join for $40.66 a month.

IV. Special Reports:
A. Report on Student Success Fees: Kimi Ikeda. PowerPoint presentation is available at: http://www.academicsenate.calpoly.edu/content/meetings_calendar
C. Report on program review – status of programs in process, summary information on reviewers, and summary of the “Senior Project Project”: Delores Lencioni, Mary Pedersen, and Erling Smith. Due to lack of time, this report is postponed until winter quarter.

V. Consent Agenda: approved as presented.

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Course Outcomes/Objectives (WASC/Academic Senate Integrated Student Learning Work Group): Giberti presented this resolution, which requests that all course learning outcomes/objectives be aligned to the program learning objectives, be approved by program faculty, communicated to students, and "publish" on course syllabus. Resolution will return as a second reading item with the following friendly amendments:

First WHEREAS, In the (date) report, the WASC visiting team recommended that "considerable efforts need to occur in the next 18 months to assure:‘1) that there is alignment between university..."

Fourth WHEREAS, By Academic Senate action, all programs were asked to evaluate the alignment of have aligned their program learning objectives to the ULOs; and

VII. Discussion Item(s): none.

VIII. Adjournment: 5:00 pm

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
Academic Senate
WHEREAS, In its report on the visit of February 10-12, 2010, the WASC visiting team recommended that considerable effort needs to occur during the Educational Effectiveness Review to assure: "1) that there is alignment between university, program, and course learning objectives across the institution; and 2) that all learning objectives appear systematically in university documents"; and

WHEREAS, This recommendation reflects the consensus on best practices among WASC-member institutions; and

WHEREAS, These practices include the use of objectives/outcomes to encourage students to be more intentional and reflective of their own learning; and

WHEREAS, By Academic Senate action, nearly all programs have aligned their program learning objectives to the University Learning Objectives ULOs; and

WHEREAS, The course proposal form has asked for a list of course learning objectives since 2000, and the new course proposal form asks for a list of University Learning Objectives and program learning objectives supported by the course; therefore be it

RESOLVED That all courses have course learning outcomes that are approved by program faculty and aligned to the program learning objectives; and be it further

RESOLVED: That course learning outcomes be published along with other course information in the Cal Poly online catalog; and be it further

RESOLVED: That course learning outcomes be communicated to students via the syllabus or other means appropriate to the course.

Proposed by: WASC/Academic Senate Integration and Student Learning Work Group
Date: October 18 2011
Revised: November 21 2011
Revised: January 5 2012
PROPOSED: That every instructor shall make available to each student in her/his class, during the first class meeting, a written course syllabus providing:

- Instructor’s contact information including office hours and office location
- A list of required text(s) and supplementary material for the course
- Methods and expectations for assessing/grading student performance for the course
- Attendance requirements and make up policy (if applicable)
- Other information the instructor deems necessary to assure the student’s understanding of the nature, requirements, and expectations of the course; and be it further

RESOLVED: That each instructor shall be required to spend a portion of the first meeting of the class discussing the course syllabus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution recognizes that faculty hold final responsibility for grading criteria and grading judgment and does not restrict the right of faculty to alter student assessment or other parts of the syllabi during the term; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the above three Resolved clauses shall become part of the Campus Administrative Policy; this policy shall be included in the Faculty Handbook; and this policy shall be communicated to all faculty at least once each year by the Provost or her/his designee.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: March 14, 2006
Revised: March 28, 2006
Revised: April 11, 2006
Revised: May 2, 2006
Theme 1: Learn-by-Doing

Learn-by-Doing is a clearly established and successful practice at Cal Poly. The team urges Cal Poly to develop measurable ways of demonstrating the educational effectiveness of this practice.

Theme 2: Teacher Scholar Model

There is a strong foundation for the teacher scholar model at Cal Poly and great opportunities to further the development of this model. Cal Poly is positioned to rapidly increase the amount of research that is occurring. It is recommended that Cal Poly continue to clarify the definitions associated with the teacher scholar model, including establishing a plan that includes targets to be accomplished by the EER visit and beyond.

Theme 3: Integration and Student Learning

Cal Poly is invested in integrating students’ learning experiences that occur in general education, in their majors, and co-curriculum. However, everyone seems to be waiting for someone else to take the initiative to take this effort forward. A leadership structure needs to be identified so that this agenda will benefit from further focus and be moved forward.

Recommendations Related to the Standards

- Considerable effort needs to occur in the next 18 months to assure: 1) that there is alignment between university, program, and course learning objectives across the institution; and 2) that all learning objectives appear systematically in university documents.

- Attention needs to be given to clearly identifying who among the leadership is responsible for educational assessment and assuring that the related educational goals are linked with budgeting.

- Questions have been raised about undue influence of donors in the operation of the university. It is recommended that the university consider an independent review of any such alleged incidences.

- The university has recently adopted an inclusive excellence initiative. The team applauds this effort. Appropriate leadership has been identified to continue this
initiative. We urge continued progress on enhancing the diversity of the students, staff and faculty, with particular attention to campus climate.

- In consideration of their current financial difficulties, it is recommended that close attention be given to maintaining the quality of buildings and facilities.

- Financial uncertainties jeopardize the future viability of the university's comprehensive polytechnic mission. It is recommended that there be continuous monitoring of university finances and that relevant financial options be considered to sustain the quality of academic offerings.

- The faculty is encouraged to invest time in reviewing the role and critical nature of faculty governance in academic decision-making.

- Attention needs to be given to creating a greater awareness of the role of the WASC self-study process in affecting institutional strategic planning.

- Apparent inconsistencies exist in the collection and utilization of data by programs. It is recommended that the university expand its capacity for institutional research and analysis to support academic decision-making.

SECTION V - Preparations for the Educational Effectiveness Report and Review

In preparation for the EER visit the University will continue to utilize its institutional themes (Overarching Theme: Our Polytechnic Identity; Theme 1: Learn-by-Doing; Theme 2: The Teacher Scholar Model; and Theme 3: Integration and Student Learning). As the University pursues these efforts in preparation for the EER, it has expressed awareness that this presents an excellent opportunity for Cal Poly to demonstrate the educational effectiveness of its signature pedagogy, Learn-by-Doing.
RESOLUTION ON CHANGES TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE GENERAL EDUCATION (GE) GOVERNING BOARD POLICY

WHEREAS, In spring 2010, the Academic Senate endorsed a proposal to establish an Academic Senate General Education (GE) Governance Board; and

WHEREAS, In spring 2010, the then GE director was responsible for GE curricular matters and some administrative GE tasks; and

WHEREAS, In spring 2010, the then GE director also received release time for both GE curricular matters and some administrative GE tasks; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate General Education Governance Board (GEGB) proposal that was endorsed by the Academic Senate in spring 2010 included some of the responsibilities listed under the duties of the GEGB and the duties of the GEGB chair; and

WHEREAS, In September 2011, the Office of Programs and Planning appointed a new Associate Vice Provost for Programs and Planning whose responsibilities include some of the same administrative GE tasks currently listed as responsibilities of the GEGB; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Associate Vice Provost for Programs and Planning be responsible for some of these same administrative General Education tasks previously assigned to the Academic Senate General Education Governance Board; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the revised list of responsibilities listed under the General Education Governance Board and the General Education Governance Board Chair in the attached proposal to establish an “Academic Senate General Education Governing Board.”

Proposed by: The Academic Senate General Education Governance Board
Date: December 12 2011
Responsibility:
Cal Poly's general education (GE) program is the administrative curricular 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 [Renumber final version]:
1. Review and approve GE course proposals.
2. Place GE curriculum proposals on the Academic Senate 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 [Renumber final version]:

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 and availability of resources in both the short and long term.
6. 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.
7. Work collaboratively with the college deans, the Provost, and the GEGB to understand resources.
8. 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 DIRECTION OF EXPENDITURES FOR THE CSU ONLINE INITIATIVE

WHEREAS, Faculty have primacy over the curriculum and have specialized knowledge of the skills and subject matter pertaining to their respective disciplines and the expertise and experience to determine which particular pedagogical methods can most effectively convey those skills and that subject matter to their students; and

WHEREAS, The success of a system-wide online initiative depends crucially on widespread faculty involvement, engagement and consultation at all stages of its development; and

WHEREAS, Well-designed and executed online programs can be a useful addition to the variety of pedagogical methods available to faculty; and

WHEREAS, A CSU system-wide initiative can offer potential benefits (1) in the financing and marketing of online programs due to economies of scale, (2) in serving as a repository of best practices developed at several CSU campuses, and (3) in creating opportunities for inter-campus collaborations; and

WHEREAS, A system-wide online initiative must address in a clear and transparent manner core issues including but not limited to (1) the intellectual property rights of faculty, (2) the quality and effectiveness of online courses, programs, and degrees, (3) faculty involvement in curriculum development, approval, and oversight, (4) student, faculty, and program assessment, and (5) the scope and nature of online offerings in comparison to traditional modes of delivery; and

WHEREAS, Faculty working at their individual campuses within their particular disciplines who have immediate knowledge both of the demands of those disciplines and the needs of their students are expected to develop their own courses and programs for the traditional classroom; the same should be held with regard to online courses; and

WHEREAS, Faculty need far greater clarity concerning the core issues (listed above) and other issues than were provided during the CSU Online Webcast of November 26 2011, during which several important issues were deferred to the newly hired Executive Director for the CSU Online initiative; and
WHEREAS, Although faculty consultation conducted thus far is described as "broad-based" on
the CSU Online website, only 10 of 23 campuses were consulted; therefore be it
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, call upon the Chancellor
to give top priority in all short-term expenditures related to the development of
CSU Online to obtaining broad-based faculty consultation and active involvement
across all 23 CSU campuses that addresses the multiple and subtle core issues
related to the development of CSU Online; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, call upon the Chancellor
to ensure the CSU neither enters into any contracts with external service providers
for CSU Online nor incurs any significant expenditures other than for the purpose
of faculty consultation until consensus has been reached among all 23 campus
Senates on a clear and transparent plan for CSU Online; and be it further
RESOLVED That copies of this resolution be distributed among CSU campus Senate Chairs,
the Executive Committee of the CSU Academic Senate, Chancellor Charles B.
Reed, Executive Vice Chancellor Ephraim P. Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor
and Chief Financial Officer Benjamin F. Quillian, the Technology Steering
Committee Presidents (Karen Haynes, Jolene Koester, Rollin Richmond, Richard
Rush, John Welty, F. King Alexander, Jeff Armstrong, Millie Garcia, Paul Zingg),
and members of the CSU Board of Trustees.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Online Task Force
Date: December 11 2011