ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA
AS-944-22

RESOLUTION ON UNITS OF CREDIT AND TIME PATTERNS
ON SEMESTER TERMS

Impact on Existing Policy: (2) Supersedes AS-453-96CC: “Resolution on Standardizing Course Units,” beginning with conversion to semester terms; (3) Reaffirmation of existing curricular and scheduling policies approved by the Academic Senate and University President, specifically AS-453-96CC: “Resolution on Standardizing Course Units”; AS-748-12: “Resolution on Shared Governance”; AS-835-17: “Resolution on Proposing New Courses or other Changes to Curricula”; and AS-922-21: “Resolution on How Credit Hour Policy Adherence Is Assessed and Assured.”

WHEREAS, The California State University Chancellor’s Office has directed Cal Poly to convert from quarters to semesters beginning in fall 2026; and,

WHEREAS, The conversion of Cal Poly’s curriculum and academic programs requires a review of every course (approximately 4,320 total courses) to determine how learning objectives will be met on a semester term; and

WHEREAS, The California State Legislature has mandated in Assembly Bill 928: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act a revision to general education in the California State University system that will include course unit requirements and will not be finalized until Spring 2024; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly currently offers courses with a range of units of credit that vary within instruction modes (Lecture, Seminar, Discussion, Activity, Laboratory, Supervision); and

WHEREAS, The California State University has set the requirements for the number of contact hours scheduled per unit of credit;

WHEREAS, The California State University has directed Cal Poly to convert from quarters to semesters beginning in fall 2026; and,

WHEREAS, The conversion of Cal Poly’s curriculum and academic programs requires a review of every course (approximately 4,320 total courses) to determine how learning objectives will be met on a semester term; and

WHEREAS, The California State Legislature has mandated in Assembly Bill 928: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act a revision to general education in the California State University system that will include course unit requirements and will not be finalized until Spring 2024; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly currently offers courses with a range of units of credit that vary within instruction modes (Lecture, Seminar, Discussion, Activity, Laboratory, Supervision); and

WHEREAS, The California State University has set the requirements for the number of contact hours scheduled per unit of credit; and

---

1 (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
WHEREAS, units of credit per course vary across the California State University System (see attached Table 1: Unit of Credits in General Education across the California State University System); and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s *Constitution of the Faculty* states that “the Academic Senate is empowered to exercise all legislative and advisory powers on behalf of the General Faculty. These legislative powers shall include all educational matters that affect the General Faculty (e.g., curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards)” (Article III.2); and

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate and University President has repeatedly reaffirmed through shared governance that curricular development is the responsibility of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate has exercised its legislative power to determine course units in “Resolution on Standardizing Course Units” (AS-453-96CC); and

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate has previously collaborated with the Office of the Registrar on scheduling time patterns, as requested by the University President; and

WHEREAS, Campus Administrative Policy states, “The University Scheduling Office has as its primary responsibility the management of academic course scheduling and University facilities usage, the management of the University’s Master Calendar, and the maintenance and continued development of the information systems utilized to maintain and support these responsibilities” (CAP 280); and

WHEREAS, time patterns are term-length neutral (e.g. a 3-unit Lecture on a quarter-length term will have the same time pattern as a 3-unit Lecture on a semester-length term); therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that each Academic Program modify each course in its respective curricula with units of credit that best meet its program needs and course learning outcomes; and be it further

---

4 See AS-748-12: “Resolution on Shared Governance” and AS-835-17: “Resolution on Proposing New Courses or other Changes to Curricula.”
5 AS-453-96CC: “Resolution on Standardizing Course Units.”
RESOLVED, That each Academic Program offering support courses uses the existing course consultation process with all Academic Programs that include its support courses as part of their required curricula; and be it further

RESOLVED, The Academic Senate collaborate with the Office of the Registrar to develop time patterns as part of the quarter-to-semester conversion process.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee

Date: April 29, 2022
Background Statement: In January 1994, the Curriculum and Calendar Task Force was appointed and charged with "establishing principles for baccalaureate programs across campus, constructing a template within which the programs will revise their curricula, integrating the co-curriculum with the baccalaureate degree, and guiding the process of change in curriculum and calendar." The extensive work of the Task Force resulted in the publication on September 29, 1995 of the "Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism" document. (Report of the Curriculum & Calendar Task Force, September 29, 1995).

At the beginning of the fall 1995 quarter, Harvey Greenwald, Chair of the Academic Senate, gave the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee the responsibility of generating, from the recommendations found in the Visionary Pragmatism document, action resolutions related to curricular matters. The following resolution is the result of the committee's work.

WHEREAS, Standardizing courses to four or more units will benefit students by allowing them to:
- register for fewer courses per term and hence allowing for greater attention to each course while maintaining or increasing the total number of credit units earned in each term;
- have fewer scheduling complications, books and materials to purchase, papers and projects to accomplish, exams to take, assignments to complete and, in general, barriers towards the completion of their degree;
- transfer units from semester campuses more efficiently; and

WHEREAS, Standardizing courses to four or more units will benefit faculty by allowing them to:
- reduce the number of class preparations per quarter and thus allow for greater attention to each course taught;
- reduce the number of students they contact per term and hence improve the quality of their interaction with these students;
- generate greater focus of their time and energy in their instructional activities and therefore enhance their efforts directed towards professional growth, research and service to the University; and

WHEREAS, Standardizing courses to four or more units can occur while preserving:
- the total number of units required in a degree;
- the number of SCU taught per term;
- the number of faculty members required to teach the curriculum;
- the number of laboratory units taught and hence Cal Poly's traditional commitment to hands-on education; and
WHEREAS, In a university curriculum, courses with fewer than four units may be desirable in the following cases:

- activity or laboratory classes (PE, Art, Music, etc.)
- classes taught in the supervision mode
- orientation classes
- library classes
- coupled classes (e.g., lecture and labs taken concurrently but listed separately)

therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That all courses taught at Cal Poly, with the exception of those listed above, be standardized to four or more units. Other cases may be appealed to the Academic Senate with appropriate documentation.

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Curriculum Committee
January 26, 1996
Revised April 9, 1996
The Academic Senate Resolution (AS-453-96/CC) on Standardizing Course Units is approved. In approving this resolution, it is my intention to initiate a process that will explore scheduling templates that minimize class conflicts and create appropriate blocks of time for laboratory instruction. I would appreciate advice from the Academic Senate on acceptable ways to structure the student contact time for the various modes of instruction used on the campus.

Please extend my appreciation to both the Academic Senate and the members of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee for this significant step toward implementation of the "Commitment to Visionary Pragmatism."
WHEREAS, One of the key tenets of quality higher education is shared governance in which responsibility for the running of the University is shared by faculty, staff, students, administrators, and trustees; and

WHEREAS, The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) “Statement on Governance of Colleges and Universities” 1990 and Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) “Shared Governance Reconsidered: Improving Decision-Making in the California State University” 2001 characterize the best practices of shared governance; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has a long history of participation in respectful, collaborative practices of shared governance; and

WHEREAS, Our new President, Provost, along with various other new higher administrators and Deans newly or soon to be hired may be unfamiliar with the implementation of shared governance at Cal Poly, and

WHEREAS, The faculty, for their own sake, also have an interest in explicitly articulating what shared governance means at Cal Poly; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The faculty affirm its primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and student educational processes; and be it further

RESOLVED: On matters wherein faculty has primary responsibility, decisions of trustees and the President should concur with faculty judgment except in rare circumstances, and for reasons clearly communicated to the faculty, and with the full input from and consultation with the faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: The faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the trustees or president; and be it further

RESOLVED: The faculty should strive to apply the model of shared governance detailed in Appendix C of the ASCSU report in The Constitution of the Faculty and the Bylaws Of The Academic Senate; and be it further
RESOLVED: The Academic Senate propose to amend the preamble to the Constitution of the Faculty to include shared governance in the definition of the functions of the Academic Senate as follows:

We, the faculty of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, in order to meet our academic responsibilities, hereby establish this Constitution of the Faculty for our governance. The responsibilities of the faculty, the powers necessary to fulfill those responsibilities, and the collegial form of shared governance are based on historic academic traditions that have been recognized by the people of the State of California through their legislature.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: March 13 2012
Revised: March 20 2012
Revised: March 30 2012
Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities

The statement that follows is directed to governing board members, administrators, faculty members, students, and other persons in the belief that the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the components of the academic institution. The statement is intended to foster constructive joint thought and action, both within the institutional structure and in protection of its integrity against improper intrusions.

It is not intended that the statement serve as a blueprint for governance on a specific campus or as a manual for the regulation of controversy among the components of an academic institution, although it is to be hoped that the principles asserted will lead to the correction of existing weaknesses and assist in the establishment of sound structures and procedures. The statement does not attempt to cover relations with those outside agencies that increasingly are controlling the resources and influencing the patterns of education in our institutions of higher learning: for example, the United States government, state legislatures, state commissions, interstate associations or compacts, and other interinstitutional arrangements. However, it is hoped that the statement will be helpful to these agencies in their consideration of educational matters.

Students are referred to in this statement as an institutional component coordinate in importance with trustees, administrators, and faculty. There is, however, no main section on students. The omission has two causes: (1) the changes now occurring in the status of American students have plainly outdistanced the analysis by the educational community, and an attempt to define the situation without thorough study might prove unfair to student interests, and (2) students do not in fact at present have a significant voice in the government of colleges and universities; it would be unseemly to obscure, by superficial equality of length of statement, what may be a serious lag entitled to separate and full confrontation. The concern for student status felt by the organizations issuing this statement is embodied in a note, “On Student Status,” intended to stimulate the educational community to turn its attention to an important need.

This statement was jointly formulated by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB). In October 1966, the board of directors of the ACE took action by which its council “recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations,” and “commends it to the institutions which are members of the Council.” The Council of the AAUP adopted the statement in October 1966, and the Fifty-third Annual Meeting endorsed it in April 1967. In November 1966, the executive committee of the AGB took action by which that organization also “recognizes the statement as a significant step forward in the clarification of the respective roles of governing boards, faculties, and administrations,” and “commends it to the governing boards which are members of the Association.” (In April 1990, the Council of the AAUP adopted several changes in language in order to remove gender-specific references from the original text.)

1. Introduction
This statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often has become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authorities, at all levels, play a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard
for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

a. Preliminary Considerations. The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process. Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand, as developed hereinafter.

b. Determination of General Educational Policy. The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his or her charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and the manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation of governing board, administration, and faculty prior to final decision.

c. Internal Operations of the Institution. The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or uni-
versity. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty.

Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part 5 of this statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well established.\textsuperscript{1}

d. External Relations of the Institution. Anyone—a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member of the faculty, or a member of the student body or the alumni—affects the institution when speaking of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An individual who speaks officially for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent.

The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of the individual's own institution is a part of that person's right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution.\textsuperscript{2} There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board

The governing board has a special obligation to ensure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: for example, the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.
The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually, when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to ensure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers—the president and the deans—and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation.

One of the governing board's important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the overall policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction. The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty. When ignorance or ill will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.

4. The Academic Institution: The President

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership. The president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system that links the components of the academic community. The president represents the institution to its many publics. The president's leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president's administration. The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to ensure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly, the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities; is responsible for public understanding; and by the nature of the office
is the chief person who speaks for the institution. In these and other areas the president's work
is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the
general support of board and faculty.

5. The Academic Institution: The Faculty
The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter
and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which
relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged
in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in
exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the
faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and
further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the
time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies, and agencies having jurisdiction over
the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the
requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus
achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes
appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure,
and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact
that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular
field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such
competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments.
Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees
having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action
through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence
of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in
other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment
except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures gov­
erning salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department
within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment fol­
lowing consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appoint­
ments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or
department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a matter of
separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelec­
tion or to reappointment by procedures that involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board,
administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a spe­
cial obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be
established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the
presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty partic­
ipation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the
institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures
determined by the faculty.

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, col­
lege, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive commit­
tees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or
the institution as a whole.

The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now
in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administra­
tion, and faculty committees; (2) joint ad hoc committees; (3) standing liaison committees; (4)
membership of faculty members on administrative bodies; and (5) membership of faculty
members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly
understood and observed.
On Student Status

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience, untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal.

Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning, it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view, and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

Notes

1. See the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure,” AAUP, Policy Documents and Reports, 10th ed. (Washington, D.C., 2006), 3-11, and the 1958 “Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings,” ibid., 12-15. These statements were jointly adopted by the Association of American Colleges (now the Association of American Colleges and Universities) and the American Association of University Professors; the 1940 “Statement” has been endorsed by numerous learned and scientific societies and educational associations.

2. With respect to faculty members, the 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” reads: “College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution” (Policy Documents and Reports, 3-4).

3. Traditionally, governing boards developed within the context of single-campus institutions. In more recent times, governing and coordinating boards have increasingly tended to develop at the multi-campus regional, systemwide, or statewide levels. As influential components of the academic community, these supra-campus bodies bear particular responsibility for protecting the autonomy of individual campuses or institutions under their jurisdiction and for implementing policies of shared responsibility. The American Association of University Professors regards the objectives and practices recommended in the “Statement on Government” as constituting equally appropriate guidelines for such supra-campus bodies, and looks toward continued development of practices that will facilitate application of such guidelines in this new context. [Preceding note adopted by the AAUP’s Council in June 1978.]

4. With regard to student admissions, the faculty should have a meaningful role in establishing institutional policies, including the setting of standards for admission, and should be afforded opportunity for oversight of the entire admissions process. [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 2002.]

5. The American Association of University Professors regards collective bargaining, properly used, as another means of achieving sound academic government. Where there is faculty collective bargaining, the parties should seek to ensure appropriate institutional governance structures which will protect the right of all faculty to participate in institutional governance in accordance with the “Statement on Government.” [Preceding note adopted by the Council in June 1978.]
This memo acknowledges receipt and approval of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution.

Please express my appreciation to the members of the Academic Senate for recognizing the importance of shared governance within the academic community.
To: Steven Rein  
Chair, Academic Senate  

Date: September 20, 2012

From: Elizabeth Kinsley  
Chief of Staff

Copies:  

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution AS-748-12

It has come to my attention that President Armstrong's June 18, 2012, response to the above-entitled Academic Senate Resolution was incorrectly addressed to you as chair of the Academic Senate, which was before your term began.

Please consider this memo as acknowledgment that President Armstrong's response should have been addressed to 2011-2012 Academic Senate Chair Rachel Femflores.

Thank you.
WHEREAS, The Constitution of the Faculty of the California Polytechnic State University empowers the Academic Senate to "exercise all legislative and advisory powers on behalf of the General Faculty," and that such "legislative powers shall include all educational matters that affect the General Faculty (e.g., curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards);" and

WHEREAS, The responsibility of the faculty for the development of curriculum and instruction is a fundamental principle supported by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities)\(^2\) and the Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU) (Collegiality in the California State University System, 1985)\(^3\) to name a few; and

WHEREAS, At times it has been necessary to reassert this principle, for example by the ASCSU (Reasserting Faculty Control of Curricula Regardless of Delivery Mode, AS-3081-12/FA/AA)\(^4\), and by the Cal Poly Academic Senate (Resolution on Shared Governance, AS-748-12)\(^5\); and

WHEREAS, Current campus procedures establish the workflow for proposing new curricula: the Office of the Registrar states that "Proposals for new courses are developed by faculty and submitted for approval through the Curriculum Management system," (http://registrar.calpoly.edu/course-policies-guidelines#Propose%20New%20), and Academic Senate Bylaws (VIII.1.2b) state that "[t]he Curriculum Committee evaluates curriculum proposals from departments and colleges;" and

WHEREAS, Faculty may welcome input or seek collaborative opportunities with anyone within the campus community, but the responsibility for the curriculum ultimately resides with the General Faculty; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the faculty reassert and reaffirm that, by virtue of the Constitution of the Faculty, development of curriculum and instruction are the purview of the General Faculty; and be it further

RESOLVED: That all proposals for new courses or other changes to curricula be made through and sponsored by the curriculum committee of the appropriate academic department(s) and associated college(s).

Proposed by: Glen Thorncroft, Senator, CENG
Paul Rinzler, Senator, CLA
Lauren Garner, Senator, CAFES

Date: December 5, 2016
Revised: April 19, 2017
Footnotes:

1 Constitution of the Faculty and the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Article III, Section 2.

2 "When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction." AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities.

3 "Because the university's curriculum is of central concern to the faculty and because faculty have the primary responsibility in curricular decisions, it follows that faculty should have the major voice in academic policy decisions which closely affect the curriculum, access to the curriculum, or the quality of the curriculum." Collegiality in the California State University System, Academic Senate of the CSU (1985).

4 "RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reassert that the quality of the curriculum for academic credit, including technology-mediated courses and online courses, remain the purview of the faculty individually and collectively." Reasserting Faculty Control of Curricula Regardless of Delivery Mode, CSU Academic Senate, AS-3081-12/FA/AA.

5 "RESOLVED: That the faculty affirm its primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and student educational processes..." Resolution on Shared Governance, Cal Poly Academic Senate Resolution AS-748-12.
MEMORANDUM
Cal Poly | Office of the President

To: Dustin Stegner
   Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jeffrey D. Armstrong
      President

Date: October 25, 2017

Copies: K. Enz Finken
        M. Pedersen
        A. Liddicoat
        G. Thorncroft
        P. Rinzler
        L. Garner

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-835-17
         Resolution on Proposing New Courses or Other Changes to Curricula

This memo acknowledges receipt of the above-entitled resolution. I want to reiterate that while the development and approval of curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty and Academic Senate, financial support and implementation of curriculum is the responsibility of the administration. While any member of the campus community may propose ideas and content for curriculum, all proposals must be sponsored by an academic department and approved through the formal curricular review and approval process prior to adoption.

Please extend my thanks to the Academic Senate members for their attention to this matter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Min/Wk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWF 3 units</td>
<td>(150 min/wk)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW, WF, MF, TR 2 units</td>
<td>(100 min/wk)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW 3 units</td>
<td>(160 min/wk)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW, WF, MF 4 units</td>
<td>(220 min/wk)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 3 units</td>
<td>(160 min/wk)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR 4 units</td>
<td>(220 min/wk)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any 4 days/wk 4 units</td>
<td>(200 min/wk)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days/wk 5 units</td>
<td>(250 min/wk)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LABS**

Any day/wk (3 hrs/wk)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:10am-11:00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10am-12:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10pm-3:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10pm-6:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10pm-9:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10pm-10:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MW/TR 4 units**

STUDIO SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:10am-9:30am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10pm-4:30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40am-11:00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:40pm-6:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10pm-1:30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10pm-7:30pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40pm-3:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40pm-9:00pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lecture and Lab taught back to back in **studio** pattern.

Select two of the above in consecutive pattern. **Must** be in department controlled space.

*Ex. TR 8:10-9:30am (Lect) | TR 9:40-11am (Lab)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Area</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>San Bernardino</th>
<th>Channel Islands</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Pomona</th>
<th>Bakersfield</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>East Bay</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Sanoma State</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Northridge</th>
<th>San Marcos</th>
<th>Chico</th>
<th>Fullerton</th>
<th>Dominguez Hills</th>
<th>Stanislaus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION ON HOW CREDIT HOUR POLICY ADHERENCE IS ASSESSED AND ASSURED

Impact on Existing Policy:

(1) This resolution does not change existing credit hour policy, but does formalize and routinize program-, college-, and university-level policies and processes that communicate and ensure the application of credit hour policy as specified by the federal government, WSCUC, and CSU.

(2) This resolution cites AS-838-17 "Resolution on Review of Courses with Condensed Time Schedules" and AS-896-20 "Resolution on Online Teaching and Learning" but does not supersede or rescind them.

WHEREAS, the California State University uses the equivalent of the Carnegie Unit for measuring and awarding academic credit that represents student work and achievement and that is also consistent with requirements of our accreditor, the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC); and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly will host a WSCUC Accreditation site visit in April 2022; and

WHEREAS, WSCUC’s Credit Hour Policy (revised November 2020) states that peer review teams will now examine documentation on

1. The adoption of a policy on credit hour for all courses and programs at the institution.

2. The processes the institution employs to review periodically the application of its policy on credit hour across the institution to assure that credit hour assignments are accurate, reliable, and consistently applied; and

WHEREAS, a CSU Chancellor’s Office memo of December 2020 states that

“For purposes of accreditation, all CSU campuses are required to develop, communicate and implement procedures for regular, periodic review of this credit hour policy to ensure that credit hour assignments are accurate, reliable and consistently applied;” and
WHEREAS, this same CSU memo continues, “Campuses will be responsible (effective summer 2021) for publishing a clearly stated practice or process that ensures they are in compliance with the student credit hour definition;” and

WHEREAS, AS-838-17 “Resolution on Review of Courses with Condensed Time Schedules” helps explicate and apply credit hour policy to courses offered outside of the conventional ten-week quarter format; and

WHEREAS, AS-896-20 “Resolution on Online Teaching and Learning” helps to clarify how credit hour equivalents can be calculated for all modes of face-to-face and online course delivery; and

WHEREAS, the curricular review process as supervised by the faculty and the course scheduling process as instituted quarterly by the Office of the Registrar both provide a rigorous assurance of the credit hour policy; therefore be it

RESOLVED: Cal Poly updates and unifies its credit hour policy as per the attached “Statement on Credit Hour Policy Assessment and Assurance (proposed May 2021).”

Proposed by: Office of Academic Programs and Planning, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: May 11, 2021

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Statement on Credit Hour Policy Assessment and Assurance

Historically, the CSU has used the equivalent of the Carnegie Unit for measuring and awarding academic credit that represents student work and achievement. The credit hour measure has also been consistent with requirements of the accreditor, the WASC Senior College and University Commission.

Federal law requires all accredited institutions to comply with the federal definition of the credit hour. CSU policy is consistent with this federal definition, and states that:

[F]or all CSU degree programs and courses bearing academic credit, the “credit hour” is defined as “the amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than:

1. one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

2. at least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution, including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.”

As in the past, a credit hour is assumed to be a 50-minute (not 60-minute) period.1

Credit hours, classroom time, and minimum expectations for out-of-class work correspond to different course modes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Mode</th>
<th>Weekly hours of classroom or direct faculty instruction per unit</th>
<th>Weekly minimum hours of out-of-class student work per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 From CSU memo AA 2011-14: “CSU Definition of Credit Hour” (revised October 2011), most of which is posted on the Academic Programs and Planning “Definition of a Credit Hour” page, in the Cal Poly Catalog in the “About the Catalog” section, and in Campus Administrative Policies 210.5 (“Credit Hour Definition”). The entire memorandum is also enclosed in Academic Senate Resolution AS-838-17 (“Resolution on Review of Courses with Condensed Time Schedules”).
Courses offered in shorter time frames (less than ten weeks) must provide the equivalent required number of classroom or contact hours.

The credit hour policy applies to all instructional modes and modalities, as well as to courses at the bachelor’s and master’s levels.

**Review Processes.** The application of this policy across the institution, to ensure that credit hour assignments are accurate, reliable, appropriate to the degree level, and conforming to commonly accepted practices in higher education, is assured by the following existing review processes:

- the New Course Proposal form, which, in order to “maintain accreditation standards and quality curricular control,” asks the proposer to specify the number of hours of face-to-face, direct synchronous, and/or asynchronous instruction, and the number of hours of out-of-class work;
- the curricular review process as supervised by the faculty, in which the approval of any course includes evaluations by the department, college, and Academic Senate curriculum committees of the course credit hours assigned;
- the course scheduling process as instituted quarterly by the Office of the Registrar, which specifically checks and confirms the correspondence between credit hour assignment and class meeting times.

Faculty are encouraged to acknowledge this policy in course syllabi so that students understand conventional expectations for work outside the classroom.

Departments are encouraged to design their own policies for the review of current courses and their adherence to credit hour policy.

**Sources.**
Academic Senate Resolution **AS-838-17**: “Resolution on Review of Courses with Condensed Time Schedules.”
Academic Senate Resolution **AS-896-20**: “Resolution on Online Teaching and Learning.”
California State University Coded Memorandum **AA 2011-14**: “CSU Definition of Credit Hour” (revised October 2011).
California State University Office of the Chancellor, “Update to Federal Definition of the Student Credit Hour,” official memorandum (December 21, 2020).
WSCUC (WASC Senior College and University Commission), “Credit Hour Policy” (revised November 2020).
MEMORANDUM

To: Thomas Gutierrez
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jeffery D. Armstrong
President

Date: June 7, 2021

Copies: Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore
Al Liddicoat
Amy Fleischer
Andy Thulin
Bruno Giberti
Cem Sunata
Christine Theodoropoulos
Dean Wendt
Gregory Bohr
Philip Williams

Subject: Response to AS-922-21 Resolution on How Credit Hour Policy Adherence is Assessed and Assured

By way of this memo, I acknowledge and approve the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution. I thank all who were involved with this effort to promptly update and unify Cal Poly’s credit hour policy in response to WSCUC policy and CSU direction. The collaboration between the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the office of Academic Programs and Planning is an exemplar of effective shared governance.

Please extend my thanks to the members of the Academic Senate for their attention to this important matter.
MEMORANDUM

To: Thomas Gutierrez
   Chair, Academic Senate
From: Jeffrey D. Armstrong
       President

Subject: Response to AS-944-22 Resolution on Units of Credit and Time Patterns on Semester Terms

Date: August 23, 2022
Copies: Rachel Fernflores
         Amy Fleischer
         Damon Fleming
         Bruno Giberti
         Terrance Harris
         Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore
         Aaron Keen
         Adriana Popescu
         Kathryn Rummell
         Cem Sunata
         Christine Theodoropoulos
         Andy Thulin
         Dean Wendt
         Philip Williams

By way of this memo, I acknowledge the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution with the following caveats:

- As stated in my response to AS-835-17, “The faculty has considerable prerogative to set curriculum, but course and curriculum size have resource and scheduling implications that are the responsibility of the administration.”
- The three-semester-unit course has been and will continue to be the building block of the CSU’s GE curriculum.
- AB 928 requires that community college students be eligible to transfer into the CSU or UC after completing a singular lower-division GE pathway; the intersegmental Special Committee on AB 928 has proposed a 34-semester-unit, lower-division GE curriculum consisting of 11 three-unit courses and one, one-unit laboratory.
- For the sake of equity, transfer and first-time students must be subject to the same degree requirements, and the CSU will adopt the AB 928 curriculum for first-time students.
- Thus, all Cal Poly students must be able to complete a 34-semester-unit, lower-division GE curriculum unless the major curriculum requires additional units in support courses.
• As established by AS-453-96, a standard course size for GE and support courses will simplify curriculum planning by faculty across departments and colleges.
• Absent a standard number of units for GE and support courses, as we previously had established with AS-453-96, faculty across departments and colleges will need to collaborate closely to ensure that service courses will allow for each major not to exceed 120 units (unless approved for more units).
• Departments will have more freedom to set the unit count of major courses, but they should be mindful of the efficiency of scheduling three-unit semester courses over a five-day week.

I am confident our faculty will be successful in collaborating with each other to ensure our semester programs are exceptional, just as our quarter programs are exceptional. I encourage additional collaboration on these important matters between the Academic Senate, the Office of the Registrar, and the provost.

Please express my appreciation to the Academic Senate members and the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee for their attention to this important matter.