I. Minutes: Approval of October 3, 2017 minutes (pp. 3-4).

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost: Enz Finken – A group from Cal Poly, comprised of President Armstrong, Keith Humphrey, Mary Pedersen, me, and others, attended the CSU Graduation Initiative (GI) Symposium earlier this month. Cal Poly is being viewed as making great progress on the GI initiative.
D. Vice President for Student Affairs: Presentation on Health Service Fee Adjustment.
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA:
G. ASI:

IV. Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO 301 Service Learning in the Health Professions (3), 2 lectures, 1 laboratory</td>
<td>Reviewed 9/21/17 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On 10/24/17 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 129 Yoga/Pilates (1), 1 activity (request to reactivate course)</td>
<td>Reviewed 10/5/17 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On 10/24/17 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 131 Group Fitness Cardio/Strength (1), 1 activity (request to reactivate course)</td>
<td>Reviewed 10/5/17 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On 10/24/17 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 143 Swimming for Non-Swimmers (1), 1 activity (request to reactivate course)</td>
<td>Reviewed 10/5/17 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On 10/24/17 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 144 Beginning Swimming (1), 1 activity (request to reactivate course)</td>
<td>Reviewed 10/5/17 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On 10/24/17 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 145 Intermediate Swimming (1), 1 activity (request to reactivate course)</td>
<td>Reviewed 10/5/17 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On 10/24/17 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 147 Advanced Swimming and Conditioning (1), 1 activity (request to reactivate course)</td>
<td>Reviewed 10/5/17 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On 10/24/17 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE 154 Weight Training (1), 1 activity (request to reactivate course)</td>
<td>Reviewed 10/5/17 and recommended for approval.</td>
<td>On 10/24/17 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. **Special Reports:**
A. Student Evaluation Update by Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair: (pp. 5-13).
B. [TIME CERTAIN 4:15 P.M.] Update from Registrar’s Office by Cem Sunata, Registrar

VI. **Business Items:**
A. Resolution in Support of the Academic Senate of the California State University’s AS-3304-17/FGA/AA/APEP Resolution on the Development and Implementation of Executive Order’s 1100 (revised) and 1110: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (pp. 14-17).
B. [TIME CERTAIN 4:30 P.M.] Resolution on Graduate Blended Program Policies: Richard Savage, Dean of Graduate Education, second reading (pp. 18-26).
C. Resolution on Retiring Obsolete Resolutions: Gary Laver, Statewide Senator, first reading (pp. 27-28).

VII. **Discussion Item(s):**

VIII. **Adjournment:**
Minutes of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, October 3, 2017
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the September 8, 2017 Academic Senate Retreat minutes.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, introduced the new Vice President of Diversity and Inclusion Jozi De Leon to the Academic Senate.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair (Stegner): Orientation for new senators – Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, introduced the caucus chairs, senators, officers, and staff members. Stegner facilitated a presentation explaining the purpose, roles, and practices of the Senate. The presentation included responsibilities of individuals based on the office they held, as well as an overview of how the Senate operates.

B. President’s Office (Darin): Jessica Darin, Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff, reported on the success of Fall Conference and the university focus on the themes of diversity and sustainability. Darin also addressed that CAP 140 Free Expression, Sponsorship, Commercialism and Use of Buildings and Grounds is being revised and will be available for feedback in a few weeks. Chancellor White has expressed his disappointments on the repeal of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy and President Armstrong has sent out a campus-wide email containing a resource link for those concerned by the DACA results as well as voicing his support for the Chancellor’s position. Darin introduced Katherine O’Clair, member of the Smoke and Tobacco Free Policy Task Force, which was created to address Executive Order 1108: Policy on Systemwide Smoke and Tobacco Free Environment that went into effect on September 1, 2017. O’Clair presented on Cal Poly’s education approach towards cessation on all Cal Poly properties including the pier, ranch, campus core, and adjacent properties. A Smoke and Tobacco Free Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) was created on the Campus Health and Wellbeing website at https://chw.calpoly.edu/be-well/smoke-and-tobacco-free-faq.

C. Provost (Enz Finken): Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, announced that the dean search committees are being created in the College of Engineering and the College of Liberal Arts. Enz Finken also reported that Cal Poly has received the results from the Western Association of Colleges and Schools (WASC) mid-cycle review and performed very well and is potentially on its way to be a top role model. The graduation rate reached 50%, the highest in Cal Poly history. Enz Finken will be leading a weekly walk on Wednesdays around the campus that begins at 12:10 PM outside of Administration Building 1. For further questions about the Wednesday Walk, please contact the Provost’s Office at extension 62186.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs (Humphrey): Keith Humphrey, Vice President of Student Affairs, reported that from 33 students admitted to Sierra Vista Hospital during the Week of Welcome (WOW), no students were admitted during WOW 2017. Humphrey and Kathleen McMahon, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs and Dean of Students, will be visiting club councils and colleges to give presentations on supporting students in crisis. Student Affairs has released its 5-year Strategic Plan and it is available for view at https://issuu.com/yukiemurphy/docs/cp_sa_strategicplanbooklet_final_8.

805-756-1258 ~ academic senate.calpoly.edu
E. Statewide Senate: none.

F. CFA (Archer): Graham Archer, California Faculty Association (CFA), mentioned that bargaining went more smoothly than last time and that the tentative agreement that extends the contract for two more years will have raises at 3.5% and 2.5% but no changes in benefits. Archer also reported that special support for new faculty and additional services would also be extended. Bargaining went a bit more smoothly than last time. Tentative agreement that extends the contract two more years. An information session on the tentative agreement will be held at the library at the end of October.

G. ASI (Nilsen, Czerny): Riley Nilsen, ASI President, reported that ASI sent out a letter of support out to all students after the DACA policy was rescinded, registered over 200 students to vote through Turbovote during WOW, and is planning its upcoming Buck the Stigma Week focused on promoting mental health awareness on campus. Nilsen encouraged faculty and students to seek alternative transportation, such as walking or biking to school if they have the opportunity, in order to alleviate the bus route issue. Daniela Czerny, ASI Chair of the Board, reported on the pilot program for free feminine hygiene products in the restrooms of the University Union and Recreation Center.

IV. Consent Agenda: The following items were approved by consent: IME 424 Industrial Engineering in Healthcare (4) and POLS 111 California Constitution and Government (1). The following items were elevated by consent: M.A. Curriculum and Instruction, M.A. Educational Leadership and Administration, M.S. Higher Education Counseling/Student Affairs, and M.S. Special Education.

V. Special Reports:
A. Presentation on CASS (Collaborative Advising for Student Success) Council: Beth Merritt Miller, Assistant Vice Provost, University Advising, presented on the CASS Council’s composition, goals and values, and current charges. Miller explained that the topics the Council is looking into include Change of Major (CMA) emerging issues and action plan, Academic Probation and Disqualification (APD) goals and implementation, and the Expected Academic Progress (EAP) Policy. The presentation is available for view at https://content.calpoly.edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/CASS_Presentation_Acad_Senate.pdf.

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Graduate Blended Program Policies: Richard Savage, Dean of Graduate Education, proposed a resolution updating the policy on Blended Programs. This resolution will return as a first reading.

VII. Adjournment: 5:00 P.M.

Submitted by,

Denise Hensley
Academic Senate Student Assistant
Online Student Evaluation of Instruction
Response Rates
2016–2017

Ken Brown
Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee chair
Fall 2017

Pilot commenced Spring 2015–Spring 2016

- **Response rates in pilot:**
  - Fall 2015: 64.3%
  - Winter 2016: 58.8%
  - Spring 2016: 50.6%

- **Procedure:**
  - Evaluation period during last two weeks of instruction
  - Students notified by email
    - One email per class per day

Procedure for university-wide rollout in Fall 2016

- **Two one-week evaluation periods**
  - Normal: Sunday–Friday of last week of instruction
  - Early: Sunday–Friday of penultimate week of instruction
    - Only Music made use of early evaluations
    - They experienced dismal response rates

- **Students notified by email**
  - Prior to evaluation period
  - Daily reminders for evaluations not yet completed
    - One email per class each day until evaluation completed

- **Response rates:**
  - Fall 2016: 66%
  - Winter 2017: 61%
  - Spring 2017: 55%

Changes in Spring 2017

- **Portal integration**
  - Students see links for class evaluations in Portal box
  - By Fall, Instructors able to see links for evaluated classes in Portal box

- **Fewer email notifications**
  - Reminders to students
    - At start of evaluation period
    - Followed by reminder emails on Wed, Thur, Fri
  - Response notifications to instructors
    - Email notification of response rates on Wed, Thur, Fri
    - Starting Fall 2017 Portal reports response rates

FAC Recommendations:

- No changes in procedures
- Continue to monitor response rates through next year
- Instructors, departments, and colleges should address response rates as they see fit
- Student participation should be based on accurate information about the nature and purpose of their evaluations of instructors and courses
Response Rates by College
Fall 2016 versus Winter 2017

Response Accumulation for
Fall 2016, Winter 2017 and Spring 2017
Fall 2016 CSM Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>78.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>73.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE</td>
<td>69.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>65.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>65.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>64.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>74.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>74.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM College Total</td>
<td>71.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winter 2017 CSM Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>69.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>63.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE</td>
<td>61.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>60.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>63.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>63.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>61.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>59.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>67.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM College Total</td>
<td>63.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2017 CSM Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>72.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>62.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE</td>
<td>51.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>48.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>50.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>55.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>60.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>61.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>64.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM College Total</td>
<td>61.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The process for developing Executive Orders 1100 (Revised) and 1110 lacked adequate shared governance and followed a severely constrained timeframe, and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of the State of California and at least 18 CSU campuses have either passed or are in the process of developing resolutions in response to the executive orders; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate support the Academic Senate of the California State University's AS-3304-17/FGA/AA/APEP Resolution on the Development and Implementation of Executive Orders 1100 (Revised) and 1110; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to Chancellor Timothy White, the California State Board of Trustees, CSU Campus Senate Chairs, and the Academic Senate of the California State University.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 10, 2017
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) object to the severely time-constrained and flawed shared governance process and consultation surrounding Executive Order 1100 (revised) and Executive Order (EO) 1110 and insist that the practice of joint decision-making mandated in HEERA be respected and adhered to; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge Chancellor White to immediately put EO 1100 (Revised) and EO 1110 into abeyance and defer their implementation date to, at earliest, Fall 2019; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that, before any future implementation, the Chancellor's Office engage in data-driven and genuine consultation with faculty, with the goals of refining both EO 1100 (revised) and EO 1110 and then implementing them on a mutually agreed upon timeline; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the Chancellor's Office work with the campuses to develop an analysis of the costs of wholesale modification of the General Education (GE) and academic preparation portions of the curriculum and share that analysis widely; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the requested analysis specifically focus on resource allocation mechanisms on the campuses and the potential deleterious effects on student success and programs, such as ethnic and cultural diversity studies, resulting from implementation of EO 1100 (revised) and EO 1110; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU requests that the Chancellor's Office ensure that the multiple measures approach called for by EO 1110 assess foundational quantitative reasoning proficiency (as outlined in the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report, page 17, Recommendation IIC); and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge Chancellor White to reinstate the recently lifted moratorium on changes in Ethnic Studies programs and departments until at least Fall 2019 to ensure that Ethnic Studies programs, departments, and faculty are integral to the fair and regular academic planning process of each campus; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU request that the Chancellor’s Office collaborate with the ASCSU in developing a plan for monitoring the efficacy of the changes in General Education and academic preparation curricula, and that the details of this plan be communicated to campus stakeholders early enough to be considered in campus curriculum planning; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provost/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, CSU campus articulation officers, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State Student Association (CSSA), CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association (ERSFA), California Community College Chancellor, California Community College Academic Senate, CSU Ethnic Studies Council and Chairs, CSU Math Council, CSU English Council, and CSU World Language Council

RATIONALE: CSU faculty and campus constituents have expressed serious concerns about the adequacy of the consultation, the content, and the timeline of revised Executive Order 1100 and newly released Executive Order 1110. The two require vast curricular changes, which bring into question the need for the hasty release of these Executive Orders during the summer break, a time when only a handful of ASCSU faculty representatives were available. The insistence by the Chancellor’s Office that the CSU needed to move forward at such a pace suggests that the administration is more attuned to the pressures of outside forces than to the needs of its students and continuing faculty efforts to meet those needs.

When an Executive Order (EO) is issued, time is needed to understand and interpret the changes and engage in clarifying conversations. Campuses also need time to discuss changes and develop appropriate curricular and pedagogic responses. CSU faculty are experts and researchers in their fields who must be relied upon when the system contemplates major changes in curriculum design. We contend that the revision to EO 1100 and the newly released EO 1110 did not arise from the fulsome shared governance process needed to reflect faculty expertise, and therefore the Senate and the faculty it represents are compelled to reject changes in curricula that do not originate through such a fulsome process.

Changes to basic curriculun policy need thoughtful consideration informed by a nuanced understanding of the rationale and impacts of proposed changes on the quality of education that CSU campuses provide and that our students deserve. In the case of EO 1100 (revised), those impacts include the consequences of acceptance of all online courses, reciprocity of all upper division GE courses, and the implications of allowing all GE courses to be double counted (EO 1100 Section 2.2.6.1).

Further, some of the unintended consequences of a rushed and poorly designed implementation can be illustrated with Ethnic Studies courses which affect students who benefit from exposure to the diverse perspectives that these courses provide. Campuses need time and resources to determine how best to proceed without damaging these courses, the programs that offer them, and the students who benefit from exposure to the diverse perspectives that these courses provide. If these courses are overlaid on GE requirements, switching the overlay may require a new course and/or new learning outcomes and also assumes the needed expertise to teach a cultural competency course. Other content areas also need thoughtful campus attention.

Therefore, implementation of the two Executive Orders must be put into abeyance until at least Fall 2019, and a data-driven, collaborative analysis of the impacts of these Executive Orders must be undertaken in concert with ASCSU and campus senates. Such analysis should focus specifically on cost, resource allocation, and the impact on departments and programs. Moreover, specific attention should be paid to defining foundational proficiency in the use of multiple measures for assessing quantitative reasoning, and to reinstating the moratorium on changes to Ethnic Studies departments and programs. The Chancellor’s Office should partner with ASCSU to develop a plan to monitor the efficacy of changes to General Education and to academic preparation.
Excerpt from letter from Chancellor White to CSU Community:

"The second set of recommendations (Recommendations 10.1-10.3) focus on maintaining the moratorium that has been in place for the past 2 1/2 years with respect to changes in ethnic studies programs and departments, particularly faculty reductions. I accept the task force recommendations to maintain the moratorium during AY 2016-17 for review, discussion and response to the report, and lift the moratorium effective July 2017. I also expect that any campus decisions regarding the status and administrative design of ethnic studies departments and programs will take the report's contents into consideration. But the ethnic studies report should not constrain the regular academic planning process of each campus, rather it should be one factor that informs the planning."
The following campuses have passed senate resolutions to delay implementation:

Dominguez Hills – Approved September 27, 2017
Fresno – Approved October 9, 2017
Fullerton – Passed September 21, 2017
Humboldt State – Approved October 3, 2017
Los Angeles – Approved October 10, 2017
Monterey Bay – Approved October 9, 2017
Sacramento – Passed September 21, 2017
San Bernardino – Approved October 10, 2017
San Diego State – Approved October 4, 2017
San Marco – Approved October 5, 2017
Sonoma State – Approved September 28, 2017
Stanislaus – Approved September 26, 2017

The following campuses have received extensions:

Monterey Bay
Sonoma

Discussing Resolutions

Bakersfield – goes to Senate on October 12, 2017
Chico
East Bay
Northridge – resolution was put on “procedural” hold until October 26, 2017
San Francisco
San Luis Obispo

Channel Islands
Long Beach
Maritime Academy
Pomona
San Jose
RESOLUTION ON GRADUATE BLENDED PROGRAM POLICIES

1 WHEREAS, Coded Memo AA-2012-01 establishes policies pertaining to CSU graduate degree programs offering simultaneous matriculation or Blended Bachelor's and Master's degree programs; and

2 WHEREAS, AA-2012-01 provides that issues not addressed in the memorandum shall be determined at the campus level; and

3 WHEREAS, The purpose of the blended program (AA-2012-01) is to provide an accelerated pathway from a bachelor's to a master's degree and to enhance the undergraduate learning experience; and

4 WHEREAS, Under Title V, a minimum of 225 total units are required (Bachelor's 180 + Master's 45) for receiving a combined (blended) degree; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the attached Policy on Blended Programs.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and Richard Savage, Dean of Graduate Education

Date: May 4, 2017
POLICY ON BLENDED PROGRAMS

ADMISSION to BLENDED PROGRAM

Students may be admitted to a blended program in their third or fourth year of undergraduate study. Admission recommendation is determined at the program level with final approval from the Graduate Education Dean. The student must submit an Admission to Blended Program Approval form. The specific requirements for admission are set by the program with approval by the Graduate Education Office and Office of the Registrar. Once accepted, students may take graduate-level courses towards master's degree requirements, as their schedules permit, provided they have the course prerequisites.

TRANSITION to GRADUATE STANDING

Students admitted to the blended program will maintain their undergraduate status until they have reached a minimum of 180 or a maximum of 196 degree applicable units towards their undergraduate degree. By the end of the first academic term in which the student has earned the appropriate degree applicable units, the student must file a post-baccalaureate change of degree objective (PBCO) form and once processed will transition to graduate status and incur the appropriate increase in tuition fees. Students must be at graduate status for a minimum of two quarters before degree completion.

DOUBLE COUNTING UNITS

A student may apply any units that are in excess of the 180 undergraduate degree minimum requirements towards both their undergraduate and graduate degree requirements, up to a maximum of 9 units (double counted units). However, neither senior project nor master's thesis/project units can be double counted.

SENIOR PROJECT REQUIREMENTS

Students in a blended program must complete all undergraduate requirements, including senior project requirements as detailed in the Cal Poly Catalog, along with their graduate master's degree culminating event requirements as detailed in the Cal Poly Catalog. A student can align the objectives of their senior project with the objectives of their thesis or project, if a thesis or project is the approved culminating event for the program. A thesis or project does not satisfy, replace or substitute for the undergraduate senior project requirement. Senior project requirements must be completed before a student begins their thesis or project requirements. Exceptions can be granted on an individual student basis and require the approval of the college dean or designee that is responsible for the graduate program.
Blended Programs (background)

Current Approved Programs

- Table 1 contains paired programs approved by Cal Poly (Fall 2016)

Policies

- Coded memorandum from CO (AA-2012-01, January 12, 2012)
  - Section 1 – “purpose of providing an accelerated pathway to a master’s degree and to enhance the undergraduate learning experience.”
  - Memorandum establishes system wide minimum processes and policies, issues not addressed in this memorandum shall be determined at the campus level.

Issues

- GradEd does not believe the memorandum supports the idea that completing a thesis satisfies, replaces or substitutes for the undergraduate requirement of a senior/capstone experience.
- The senior project is a cornerstone of the Cal Poly “Learn by Doing” experience and is required for all Cal Poly students receiving a baccalaureate degree. It integrates theory and application from across the student's undergraduate educational experiences. Clearly, the Senior Project experience is something that parents, students and employers expect to be part of any Cal Poly's bachelor degree experience.

Questions

- What about other culminating events: projects or exams, do they satisfy the senior project requirement?
- The memorandum (AA-2012-01) does specify in section 8.0 that blended students who choose to not complete their master’s degree can petition for and receive their bachelor’s degree without any additional costs. How can they receive their bachelor’s degree at no additional costs if they have not taken the required senior project requirements?
- The Cal Poly Academic Programs website describes one of the advantages of blended programs is to “provide a meaningful capstone experience that in most cases integrates the senior project with the graduate thesis/project”. Many blended programs have correctly interpreted “integrates the senior project with the graduate thesis/project” to mean that a student can integrate the foundational goals and learning outcomes of both experiences. For example, a student can investigate a topic to the level necessary to demonstrate that they have achieved their senior project learning outcomes and then extend their study of the topic to the level necessary to demonstrate the educational learning outcomes required for their master’s degree culminating experience. However, some programs have incorrectly interpreted this “integration” to mean that a master’s thesis or project replaces a senior project or substitutes for a senior project. Please be sure to clearly define the learning outcomes for both experiences.
(senior project and master’s culminating event) in the new Academic Catalog 17-19 and ensure that students are in compliance with both of these important components of their educational experience at Cal Poly.

- Does CLOs from thesis duplicate CLOs from senior project requirements?
- What happens when a student does not complete their thesis.....but has all the UG units (tech electives were substituted for senior project)....so they get bachelor’s from CP without a senior project?
- Some blended programs want to accepted students that do not have an undergraduate degree in their major. Do students from these paired programs get a pass on doing a senior project?
- This same argument of a thesis substituting or replacing a senior project could be applied to upper class courses....why take a lower class course, you can just learn what you need when you take the upper class course?
- ABET accreditation requires a senior or capstone experience; this is not in compliance with our accreditation standards?

Table 1

Cal Poly Graduate Programs
Approved Blended Paired Programs
2/20/2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENG</th>
<th>Master's Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil &amp; Environmental</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science, CSC</td>
<td>Computer Science, CSC</td>
<td>Computer Engineering, CPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Software Engineering, SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Engineering, CPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials Engineering, MATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering w/Integrated Tech Mgmt</td>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials Engineering, MATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS Agriculture w/Food Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Science w/ Advanced Food Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Science w/ Applied Food Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Provosts/Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs

FROM: Ephraim P. Smith
Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer

SUBJECT: “Blended” or “4 + 1” Bachelor’s and Master’s Degree Programs

This coded memorandum establishes systemwide minimum processes and policies pertaining to CSU undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered to students through simultaneous matriculation. Combinations that blend degree and credential programs are excluded, and issues not addressed in this memorandum shall be determined at the campus level.

Campuses are not required to offer blended programs, and the standards included herein are minimum requirements. Campuses wishing to offer blended bachelor’s and master’s programs will need to be aware that timely coordination is required between the academic department and the campus registrar’s office to ensure accurate recording of the student’s transition from undergraduate to graduate status. This will have direct consequences for student fee assessment and financial aid eligibility, as types of aid and award amounts may vary according to the student’s official academic objective. Appropriate state funding to the campus will also depend on accurate recording of student transition in blended programs.

1. Authorization to Implement Blended Programs

The president or designee is authorized to implement programs blending existing baccalaureate and master’s degree programs in the same support mode and for the purposes of providing an accelerated pathway to a master’s degree, and to enhance the undergraduate learning experience. Campuses shall establish, monitor, and maintain appropriate academic rigor and quality.
1. Authority to grant postbaccalaureate and graduate special-action admission is provided under Title 5 section 41001:

An applicant who does not qualify for admission under the provisions of subdivisions (a) or (b), or both such subdivisions, of Section 41000, may be admitted by special action if on the basis of acceptable evidence the applicant is judged by appropriate campus authority to possess sufficient academic, professional and other potential pertinent to the applicant's educational objectives to merit such action.

1.2 Blended programs must meet all applicable CSU policies and state and federal laws.

2. Reporting

2.1 Blended bachelor's and master's degree programs will continue to use the existing CSU degree program codes (formerly “HEGIS”) and Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes for their component undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Unlike concurrent degree programs, new CSU degree codes will not be assigned for the blended bachelor's and master's programs.

2.2 To ensure that enrollments are reported accurately, the campus is required to notify Academic Programs and Policy in the Chancellor’s Office, signaling an intention to implement the planned blended program. The resultant Chancellor’s Office software edits will allow accurate reporting in the CSU Enrollment Reporting System (ERS), without receiving an “error” message.

2.3 While students in regular, non-blended, baccalaureate and graduate programs have a degree objective code that ranges from digits “2” to “7,” students in blended programs have only the digit “9” as their degree objective code.

2.4 When a blended-program student has earned at least 120 semester/180 quarter units toward program completion, the campus will change the student level code to “5,” signifying graduate standing. As these students have yet to attain either a baccalaureate or master’s degree, their degree held code will remain as either “0” or “1.” The term FTE calculation for these students will be: 12 units equals one FTES.

3. Application to Blended Programs

3.1 A student must apply to the blended program while in undergraduate status and will be admitted as an undergraduate to the bachelor’s component of the blended program.

3.2 Students shall not be required to apply formally for graduate admission.
4. Enrollment and Enrollment Status
4.1 While in undergraduate status, a student in a blended program will take graduate-level courses required for the master's degree.

4.2 At the end of the first academic term in which blended-program students have earned at least 120 semester/180 quarter units (the minimum required for the regular baccalaureate major degree program), the campus will change the student-level codes to “5,” signifying graduate degree objective status.

4.3 Units considered toward meeting this degree-objective status threshold may include either undergraduate or graduate, and shall include only those units that count toward satisfying either the bachelor’s or master’s requirements in the blended program.

4.4 To ensure proper awarding of degree credit, all lower-division work (including lower-division general education courses and American Institutions courses) shall be completed prior to changing to graduate degree objective status.

5. International (F-1 Visa Holder) Students
A letter must be submitted to the appropriate office on campus to indicate the change of degree status for international students. This requirement is related to the students’ need to maintain full-time status, as the number of units required for full-time status is different at the undergraduate level and graduate level.

6. Tuition Fees
6.1 A student will be assessed the undergraduate State University Tuition Fee only during the time in which the blended-program student has earned fewer than 120 semester/180 quarter units applicable to the blended bachelor's and master's degree programs.

6.2 When the degree-objective status is changed to “graduate,” the student will be assessed the graduate student fee, and may continue to take upper-division undergraduate courses.

6.3 Students in a master’s degree program that has been authorized to assess the higher graduate professional degree (“MBA Fee”) will only be charged that tuition fee for courses required to complete the fee-approved master’s degree program.

7. Minimum Requirements for Completion of Blended Programs
A minimum of 150 semester units (120 + 30) or 225 quarter units (BS 180 + MS 45) are required in blended programs.
8. **Provision for Completing the Baccalaureate Portion Only**
   If a student in a blended program opts not to complete the master’s program but does complete the undergraduate degree requirements, undergraduate matriculation shall be re-opened in order to grant the baccalaureate degree. There shall be no related cost to the student nor refund of previous graduate fees paid.

9. **Awarding of Degrees**
   Both degrees may be awarded during the same term and at a single graduation ceremony, as authorized by Executive Order 702 ([http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-971.html](http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-971.html)).
   Students are evaluated for Latin honors based on the first 120 semester units or 180 quarter units (i.e. the time period of undergraduate degree objective), regardless of the number of graduate courses taken prior to the transition to graduate status.

For questions regarding Enrollment Reporting System coding, please contact Dr. Philip Garcia at (562) 951-4764 or pgarcia@calstate.edu. Admission questions and Common Management System issues may be directed to Mr. Eric Forbes at (562) 951-4744 or eforbes@calstate.edu. Financial aid questions should be addressed to Mr. Dean Kulju at (562) 951-4737 or dkulju@calstate.edu. Dr. Christine Mallon may be reached at (562) 951-4672 or cmallon@calstate.edu to answer questions related to curriculum.

ES/clm

c: Dr. Ron Vogel, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
   Dr. James Postma, Chair, Academic Senate, CSU
   Dr. Philip Garcia, Senior Director, Analytic Studies
   Mr. Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support
   Dr. Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Research and Resources
   Dr. Christine Mallon, State University Dean, Academic Programs and Policy
   Dr. Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Teacher Education and Public School Programs
   Campus Academic Senate Chairs
   Associate Provosts/Associate Vice Presidents, Academic Affairs
   Deans, Graduate Studies
   Directors, Admission and Records
WHEREAS, A resolution approved by Cal Poly's Academic Senate reflects the concerns and
campus organization of the time in which it is adopted; and

WHEREAS, With the passage of sufficient time an adopted resolution may no longer hold
relevance; and

WHEREAS, Such obsolete resolutions should be identified and formally removed from the set of
active resolutions; and

WHEREAS, No process currently exists for determining the obsolescence of Academic Senate
resolutions or for their formal retirement; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be amended as shown on the attached copy to
guide the formal retirement of resolutions by the Academic Senate.
V. MEETINGS

E. RETIRING RESOLUTIONS

When an Academic Senate resolution is suspected of being out of date or no longer pertinent, at the Chair’s discretion the resolution may be submitted for review as to its current relevance by the Academic Senate committee that originally sponsored it or by an ad hoc committee. The committee’s opinion regarding the resolution shall be forwarded to the Academic Senate Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee finds that the resolution in question should be retired, a proposal to this effect shall be placed on the Academic Senate’s consent agenda. If no senator pulls the resolution from the consent agenda, the resolution shall be considered retired. If pulled from the consent agenda, the proposal will appear as a business item for debate at the next meeting of the Academic Senate. The President shall be informed of any such action and the Academic Senate shall update its records.