Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Tuesday, October 16, 2018  
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: Approval of September 25, 2018 minutes: (pp. 2-3).

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost: (p. 4).
D. Statewide Senate: (pp. 5-22).
E. CFA:
F. ASI: (p. 23).

IV. Business Item(s):
A. Appointment of Ken Brown, Philosophy Department as CLA Caucus Chair for the 2018-2019 academic year.
B. Appointment of Grace Yeh, Ethnic Studies Department to the CLA Caucus for the 2018-2019 academic year.
C. Appointment of Gregory Schwartz, Bioresource and Ag Engineering Department to the CAFES Caucus for the 2018-2020 term.
D. Election of Chairs for the GE Area Workgroups: (to be distributed).
E. Appointments to Academic Senate Committees: (pp. 24-25).
F. Appointment to University Committees: (p. 26).
G. [TIME CERTAIN 3:45 P.M.] Resolution on Use of Campus for Visiting Speakers to Protect Core Operations and Provide Transparency: Margaret Bodemer, History Department and Carrie Langner, Psychology and Child Development Department (pp. 27-29).
H. Resolution on Campus Climate: OUDI Collective Impact Report, Funding, and Student Fees: Harvey Greenwald, Emeritus Academic Senate Chair (pp. 30-31).
I. Resolution on Senior Project Policy: Dawn Janke, Senior Project Task Force Chair (pp. 32-39).
J. [TIME CERTAIN 4:10 P.M.] Resolution on Minors: Brian Self, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Chair (pp. 40-46)
K. Resolution to Modify the Bylaws of the Academic Senate: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair (pp. 47-48).

V. Discussion Item(s):
A. Modification of Attachments
B. Waitlist Changes

VI. Adjournment:
Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Tuesday, September 25, 2018  
01-409, 3:10 to 5:00 p.m.

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, asked members of the Executive Committee to volunteer as a representative from the Academic Senate to the ASI Board of Directors meetings. He also announced that the Statewide Academic Senate is asking for nominations for the 2019-2021 Faculty Trustee.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, reported on the Academic Senate Retreat and thanked those who attended.
B. President’s Office: Jessica Darin, Chief of Staff, announced that the Cal Poly Opportunity Grant and Fee was approved by the Chancellor and will be implemented in September of 2019. Darin also provided an update on the Campus Diversity and Inclusion Task Force.
C. Provost: Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost, reported on the budget of Academic Affairs. She also reported that Cal Poly received more money in base dollars from the Graduation Initiative 2025. She reported that Academic Affairs was completing its Strategic Plan. She thanked those who participated in the General Education portion of the Academic Senate retreat. Lastly, she discussed the current status with the diversity cluster hire.
D. Statewide Senate: Jim Locascio, Statewide Senator, discussed a resolution being brought forward in November that would include tuition for what is covered by the Cal Grant Program. Gary Laver, Statewide Senator, reported on the current conversation of Executive Order 1100 (revised) and the CSU Budget from the Statewide Senate. Laver reported on the creation of more Executive Orders concerning student immunizations, student organizations, and enrollment management/advising. He also reported that the legislature offered 1.2 million dollars for the CSU and UC systems to offer unconscious bias training. Lastly, he reported that the Statewide Senate Faculty Affairs Committee would be looking into intellectual property as it pertains to online classes.
E. CFA: Neal MacDougall, CFA Representative, announced that CFA membership has seen an increase both statewide and here at Cal Poly.
F. ASI: Jasmin Fashami, ASI President, announced that the ASI Executive Cabinet is focusing on voter registration for the upcoming local elections. Mark Borges, Chair of ASI Board of Directors, announced the upcoming schedule of presentations for the Board of Directors for fall quarter.

IV. Business Items:
A. Approval of 2018-2019 Committee Charges. M/S/P to approve the 2018-2019 Academic Senate Committee Charges. Committee charges can be found in the meeting agenda at: https://content.calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/documents/ea_092518.pdf
B. Appointments to Academic Senate Committees for the 2018-20 term. M/S/P to approve the following appointments to Academic Senate Committees:
   - College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences
     - Fairness Board
     - Julie Huzzey, Animal Science
College of Architecture and Environmental Design
Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee
Jason Hailer, Construction Management
Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee
Sandy Stannard, Architecture
Instruction Committee
Carmen Trudell, Architecture

College of Liberal Arts
Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee
Julie Rodgers, Psychology & Child Development
Curriculum Appeals Committee
Doug Keesey, English
Josh Machamer, Theatre and Dance

Orfalea College of Business
Distinguished Scholarship Awards Committee
Patricia Dahm, MHRIS Area
Professional Consultative Services
Faculty Affairs Committee
Brett Bodemer, Library

Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee
Doug Keesey, English
Sandy Stannard, Architecture
Josh Machamer, Theatre and Dance

C. Appointments to University Committees for the 2018-2019 academic year. M/S/P to approve the following appointments to University Committees:

College of Agriculture, Food, and Environmental Sciences
Intellectual Property Review Committee
Peter Livingston, BRAE (2018-20)

Colleage of Science and Math
Grants Review Committee
Crow White, Biological Sciences

D. Approval of 2 additional WTUs, for a total of 4 WTUs, to Fairness Board for the 2018-2019 Academic Year. M/S/P to approve 2 additional WTUs, for a total of 4 WTUs, to Fairness Board for the 2018-2019 Academic Year.

College of Science and Math
Athletics Advisory Board
Robert Holtzapple, Physics (2018-21)

Campus Parking and Transportation Advisory Committee
Scott Johnston, Physics (2018-20)

Campus Safety and Risk Management Committee
Eric Jones, Chemistry & Biochemistry (2018-20)

E. Resolution on Campus Climate: OUDI Collective Impact Report, Funding, and Student Fees:
Camille O’Bryant, Associate Dean CSM, and Harvey Greenwald, Mathematics Department, presented a resolution on campus climate which would endorse the process of Collective Impact carried out by OUDI, call for the raising of funds in support of diversity and inclusivity with targeted goals, and asks for an audit of all Campus Academic Fees. This resolution will return to the Academic Senate Executive Committee.

F. Resolution on Course Criteria for GWR-Certified Upper-Division Courses Across the Curriculum:
Dawn Janke, GWR Task Force Chair, presented a resolution that would ask for a GWR Advisory Board, consisting of people from across the university community to assist with the GWR course certification process. M/S/P to agendize the Resolution on Course Criteria for GWR-Certified Upper-Division Courses Across the Curriculum.

G. CONFIDENTIAL: Naming of Building.

V. Adjournment: 5:10 PM

Submitted by,

Mark Borges
Academic Senate Student Assistant

805-756-1258 ~ acedemicsenate.calpoly.edu
October 16, 2018  
Provost Enz Finken’s Report to the Senate Executive Committee

On October 9, all tenure-line faculty and lecturers were sent an email with active links to the CSU Student Success Dashboard. This tool allows faculty to explore data about the students in their courses and their department including student demographics, students who leave without completing their degree, and particular classes in which students struggle. Other information specific to each department is also available.

On an annual basis, departments are being asked to simultaneously review their key Graduation Initiative 2025 metrics and update their strategic action plans, which result from the program review process. These newly merged requests, supported by data available in the Student Success Dashboard, will be beneficial in establishing priorities and opportunities for continuous improvement over the next few years. Questions regarding the dashboard and updating department action plans can be directed to the Office of Academic Programs and Planning.
My statewide report has three sections:  

[1] My observations  


[3] The official minutes from the Academic Affairs Committee meeting on September 5, 2018 (AA Committee)

[1]

a. SB 1400 is legislation meant to facilitate transfer from the CCC to the CSU and UC system. The CCC's submit courses to the Transfer and Articulation System for California's colleges and universities for approval. The courses are to be reviewed by CSU faculty to insure that they meet CSU requirements. There is a big backlog of course to be reviewed because CSU faculty are not willing to review classes. I have approached the hospitality and construction management faculty with no success.

b. Governor Brown is a big supporter of online courses and at his request the CSU has made it easy for students from any campus to take online course at any campus. My concern is with regards to “residency units in the major.” It appears that these online course will count as residency units at all campuses.

c. Last June the ASCSU passed a resolution asking for the state to fully fund the State University Grant (SUGs) which is currently underfunded by $700 M. The Chancellors office endorses the concept but does not believe it will be successful. It is my mission this year to contact, in writing, all the California legislators asking for them fully fund SUGs on the moral grounds, they created the program, they stopped fully funding in 1992, and this funding that is need to enhance student success.

d. It should be noted that EO-1100 and EO-1110 are still contentious among the campus faculty. Senator Jon Bruschke from CSUF has made it his mission allow campuses more autonomy in designing their GE&B programs.

[2]

Report from ASCSU September 6-7, 2018

John Tarjan and Janet Millar

1. Chair Nelson referred us to her written report. Chair Nelson's current and past chair reports can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Chairs_Reports/

2. Excerpts from Other Reports
   • Academic Affairs discussed the following topics.
- Reviewed the prior year AA annual report.
- 2018 ITL Summer Academy Report
- EO 1100 (rev.) update
- EO 1110 Update
- Faculty leadership & Innovation Award Update
- Community Engagement
- ASCSU White Paper on Student Success—definitions of success
- State University Grants
- Three resolutions (see below for the one on commemorating service learning which was presented for first reading)
- Student Performance Gaps (by race)
- CCC Online College
- Enrollment in online courses on campuses other than the one where a student is enrolled
- Intellectual Property
- CSU BOT Education Policy Agenda including the GI 2025 and RSCA Funding (to support creative activity & scholarship)

- **Academic Preparation and Education Programs** discussed the following topics.
  - WestEd study looking at implementation of EO 1110 (update and solicitation of advice for improving data collection) Campus visitations have already begun. The results from this summer’s early start programs seem promising.
  - The potential use of Smarter Balanced (free-to-the-students assessment given in the junior year of high school, and before) as a factor in CSU admissions. Concerns were expressed that the test was not designed for that purpose.
  - C-ID descriptor and transfer model curricula reviews. The lack of CSU faculty participation is an ongoing issue.
  - Notification to the CO when a TMC will no longer be accepted by a campus major.
  - Recruitment of potential teachers of color.
  - Preparation of special education teachers.
  - Inclusive teaching.
  - Potential requirement of a 4th year of math/quantitative reasoning in the a-g admissions requirements.

- **Faculty Affairs** discussed the following topics.
  - Potential clinical track faculty in the CSU Sacramento nursing program.
  - EO 1096 (Title IX issues).
  - State allocation for unconscious bias training in the UC and CSU.
  - Shared governance in the CSU.
  - Online education: intellectual property, academic freedom, faculty evaluation, student success, etc.
  - Where the $25m of additional state funding for tenure track faculty hiring is actually being spent in the CSU.

- **Fiscal and Governmental Affairs** discussed the following topics.
Position paper on GI 2025—graduation rates and number of graduates are often confounded in people's minds but are not necessarily strongly associated.

New modes of lobbying for the year.

GE Advisory Committee discussed the following issues.
- Reviewed the Chancellor's charge to the committee.
- EO 1036—system-wide credit for prior learning—differences in credits awarded.
- GE Course Reviewers Guiding Notes revisions
- Gathering data from the campuses about best practices in GE assessment

GE Task Force
- Is focusing on student success.
- A review of the GE Area Breadth is probably long overdue.
- Campus ability to tailor the program for their students' needs is transcendent.
- Students do not understand GE programs—they seem cumbersome.
- The members have consensus on several things.
  - Need to increase coherence.
  - More consistency needed.
  - Learning outcomes and assessment need to be important components.
  - Intentionality should be more obvious.
  - Learning should lead to meta cognition.
  - Scaffolding of learning should be built in across courses.

Other Issues Being Discussed
- Values statement and communications plan
- Methods to increase value to students and communicate
- Decreasing complexity
- Reduce "hidden" requirements (e.g., AI, GWAR)

Many senators provided feedback to the task force related to double-counting, impact on departments' staffing, high unit majors, preparation for life success, refocusing on student learning outcomes rather than courses, the importance of ethnic studies, the importance of breadth, the value of a liberal education, etc.

3. Faculty Trustee Sabalius reported on the success of getting over $100m more in state allocation than initially requested by the BOT. Unfortunately, much of the additional money is one-time funds. We believe the unified lobbying efforts across the CSU were critical in reversing the proposed cuts by the Governor and the additional funding. We hired 3 presidents this year. Dr. Sabalius detailed his campus visits and many other commitments as faculty trustee, including meeting with legislators. Written faculty trustee reports can be found at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Faculty_Trustee/index.shtml

4. We elected the CSU Faculty Recommending Committee which will screen candidates for the faculty trustee position which term begins in the fall 2019. The elected members include
5. We passed a "Commendation of Eric Forbes," retiring Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management.

6. We introduced the following resolution that will be considered for adoption at our November plenary. Copies of this resolution should be available shortly for campus review.
   a. Observing the 20th Anniversary of the CSU Center for Community Engagement, and Student Success in Service Learning and Community Engagement encourages both system and campus-based observations to highlight the successes in service learning and community engagement across the system.

7. The body engaged in an informal discussion of “Tenets of System Level Governance in the California State University” (see the copy of this document at the end of this report). This document was developed jointly by the 2017-18 Executive Committee and system administrative leadership. The 2017-2018 Senate chose not to waive a first reading of a resolution endorsing the document last spring, effectively tabling the item. This discussion was an attempt to determine the will of the body on how to proceed.

8. Jennifer Eagan (CFA Liaison): Provided the following written report.
   1. We get a 3.5% raise on Nov. 1 (Dec check) and a 2.5% raise on July 1 next year (Aug check).
   2. It’s election season, so CFA will be advocating for our endorsed candidates. We’ll be working hard for Gavin Newsom and especially Tony Thurmond for Superintendent of Public Instruction. Chapters will be working on local state races as well. You can see a list of our endorsed candidates and positions on some props here: https://www.calfac.org/endorsements
   3. You can take action by signing up to phone bank and walk with your chapter here: https://www.calfac.org/take-action There’s also a link on this page for you to email Gov. Brown asking him to sign SB 968 into law (see below).
   4. CFA will be out for Rise for Climate, Jobs & Justice March in San Francisco this Saturday, meeting at 10am at the corner Steuart and Embarcadero. If you’re in the neighborhood, come on out, it should be fun. Details here: https://www.calfac.org/headline/other-news-34
   5. Three of our sponsored bills are on route to the Gov. ’s desk.
      • AB 2505 (Santiago): CSU Reporting This bill would establish regular CSU reports. The report would include a review how staffing decisions are
currently made and best practices from other public segments. **Status:** Passed Asm Floor on Concurrence 08/29/18 (79-0) – to Enrollment.

- **SB 968 (Pan): Mental Health Counselor / Student Ratio** This bill would require each CSU campus to hire one mental health counselor per 1,500 students. The bill also requires a campus mental health survey every three years and campus reporting on attempted suicides. **Status:** Passed Sen Floor on Concurrence 08/30/18 (39-0) – to Enrollment.

- **SB 1421 (Skinner): Right to know** This bill would modify the special secrecy for police officers to make records available to the public in cases involving sexual assault or dishonesty in criminal investigations, where accusations were sustained after due process. The bill would also make available records related to police shootings and other serious or deadly uses of force incidents, after 180 days, or after an investigation has been concluded (whichever comes first). **Status:** Passed Sen Floor on Concurrence 08/31/18 (26-11) – to Enrollment.

6. Please sign up for CFA Headlines which will come straight to your email box: [https://www.calfac.org/cfa-headlines](https://www.calfac.org/cfa-headlines)

7. Please also listen to our podcast, with the latest editions from the great Theresa Montaño, Professor of Chicana and Chicano Studies at Cal State Northridge and VP of CTA and a report from Demos and the SEIU Racial Justice Center on creating a politically effective race-class narrative: [https://www.calfac.org/radio-free-csu](https://www.calfac.org/radio-free-csu)

9. **Manolo P. Morales** (Alumni Council President) shared some of the activities and challenges of the system and campus alumni groups. They were very happy to be very involved in advocacy for an increased budget for the CSU. Last year the council focused on mentoring and meeting students' basic needs (food and housing). This year's goals include making increased progress in meeting students' basic needs. Alumni Trustee Nilon has been very effective in his role on the Board. Because the alumni trustee is elected by the alumni rather than appointed by the Governor, he/she is in a unique position to be a strong independent voice.

10. **Chancellor Timothy White** began by thanking ASCSU for their part in our successful advocacy efforts last year that resulted in a budget increase. He also thanked the selection committee for the new Faculty Innovation and Leadership Innovation Awards. CSU administration is drafting a preliminary budget request for the Board to consider. (It may be in the range of a $400m increase.) Stress is placed on the campuses when they have to plan for students and hire faculty and staff before final budgets are allocated. We hope to come to an agreement (compact?) with the new Governor related to multi-year funding and workload levels. We have insufficient funds to meet our infrastructure needs. We are in preliminary discussions with the UC for a joint bond issue that would fund needed new construction and critical deferred maintenance. We also hope that the state will offer a general obligation bond to help address infrastructure needs. There is no intention to increase tuition this year but state law mandates that consultation on potential tuition
increases begin almost a year in advance so contingent conversations have begun with CSSA just in case disastrous unforeseen events happen and a tuition increase might appear unavoidable. New monies have been allocated for faculty hiring this year. Most of the budget increase from last year had to be allocated to pay increases and other mandatory costs. As a result, only $75m was allocated to the campuses for hiring.

In response to questions & comments: We have been able to leverage our size to save money and increase value of our funds spent in procurement because of our size. We are partnering with the UC to increase this leverage. It is always a balancing act to try to be more efficient through system cooperation while allowing campuses to have the autonomy to optimize the way in which their resources are allocated. Our federal legislative priorities include student financial aid (very important to our students), research funding (very important to our faculty) and immigration issues (very important for our broader community). We got about $120m in one-time money to be spent over 4 years (the first time something like this has happened). We allocated $20 this year and anticipate allocating significantly more next year. Unfortunately, increasing costs keep eating into our budgets. We have updated our estimate of CSU deferred maintenance. It is getting close to $4b.

Construction costs are skyrocketing across the country—up 18% in CA last year. We find that emphasizing completion rates and graduation numbers are paid attention to among many decision-makers. In the academy we need to continue to also focus on other dimensions of student success. We need to build the capacity of the CSU or CA will fall far short of reaching its goals for its citizens.

11. EVC Loren Blanchard indicated that preparation for next week’s Board meeting continues. Items being prepared for the Education Policies Committee include presentations on

- International Programs
  - Study abroad,
  - International collaborations
  - International students
  - International alumni
  - Faculty professional development—training and research
- Research, Scholarship & Creative Activities
- Progress on GI 2025, including both preparation and enrollment management
- Implementation of EO 1110, including a preliminary report on the WestEd study of campus implementation during the past summer

Note: Board meetings are livestreamed: https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees

On October 17-16 a GI 2025 symposium will be hosted by SDSU. The plenary sessions will be livestreamed. https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/why-the-csu-matters/graduation-initiative-2025/symposium/2018-symposium

Several Executive Orders will likely be revised during the coming year dealing with:

- Immunizations
- Title XI policies
- Student Organizations
Dr. Blanchard was very complementary of the leadership retreat organized by the ASCSU Executive Committee which focused on student success. Student success has three components: learning, access, and completion. The graduation initiative has three interrelated goals: increase graduation rates while maintaining quality, eliminate achievement gaps, and meet the state's workforce needs. In response to questions: The system and campuses are addressing how to increase SFR and tenure density given current budget levels and one-time funding structures. We are aware of gender issues in reducing achievement gaps. Online education is very much in the spotlight, especially given the development of online education in the CCC. Before we partner with outside groups and share data with said groups, our general counsel office reviews agreements to ensure compliance with mandated protection of student data. The CO perspective on student success dovetails with that of the faculty but we perhaps place relatively more emphasis on access and completion. We recognize that we need significantly more enrollment growth dollars (3-5%) than is our base budget to effectively meet our goals for the GI 2025. We clearly have fallen short in funding. The UC and private schools will have to provide more access if the state is to meet its workforce development goals.

12. Jason Wenrick (Executive Director, Common Human Resource System [CHRS]) CHRS is being rolled out campus-by-campus across the system. There have been 24 different HR systems across the CSU (including the CO) with different applications, data recording and reporting, etc. PeopleSoft 9.0 is not even being supported any longer. This effort to modernize and coordinate our HR system(s) should result in cost savings, make mandatory reporting to external groups easier, and significantly improve HR support across our campuses. The system should provide better support for
- Recruiting
- Workforce Administration
- Benefits Administration
- Absence Management
- Time and Labor Management
- Temporary Faculty Management
- Support of Negotiated Contracts
- etc.

Software design is complete, 23% of the software has been completed. We are currently preparing for the first wave of campus implementation in 2020. Piloting of a couple of modules (recruiting) will begin on 5 campuses beginning in January 2019.

13. AVC James Minor began by mentioning the faculty Leadership and Innovation Awards and expressing his appreciation to the selection committee for their fine work. There were 26 awards made and well over 300 applicants. The 26 awardees will be featured in a media campaign. He then updated us on GI 2025. He mentioned the upcoming GI 2025 conference (see links above for more information). It is likely that all sessions will be livestreamed. Campus watch parties will be supported, with goodies available for those attending via livestream on a campus. The data from campuses offering EO 1110 supported/Early Start summer sessions
this year are quite promising. Student success in mathematics under this model seems to have increased significantly and progress was made much faster than is being made by students in the same category beginning studies during the normal school year. Significant funds are being allocated to campuses to support the implementation of EO 1110. The GI 2025 workgroups continue to meet and have generated many recommendations, many of which overlap. There will be an attempt to continue to support the workgroups and coordinate their work.

14. Wilson Hall (CSSA Liaison) student leaders from across the state recently at CSULB for CSUnity with state decision-makers to develop an advocacy plan for the year. The policy agenda for CSSA this year includes the following items.
- Providing food and housing (basic needs) for all students.
- Assuring accessibility, affordability, and sustainability for the CSU.
- Academic success and a holistic learning experience for all students.
Several senators offered suggestions for addition issue to address including alcohol on campus and its correlation with sexual assault, serving the needs of "non-traditional" students, being an advocate for equity at all levels of education, serving graduate students, etc.

15. Bill Blischke (ERFSA President) Began by enumerating the many ways in which retired faculty continue to contribute to their campuses, many of which overlap with their former roles. Note: ERFSA provides many very valuable resources for retired and nearly-retired CSU employees. The website is particularly valuable. http://csuerfa.org/

Tenets of System Level Shared Governance in the California State University

The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) and the Chancellor affirm their commitment that joint decision making is the long-accepted manner of shared governance at the system level. Shared governance refers to the appropriately shared authority, responsibility and cooperative action among governing boards, administration and faculty in the governance and accountability of an academic institution.

The Constitution of the ASCSU establishes the purpose of the systemwide senate, as well as the means of consultation and decision making by which the senate will act. Both the ASCSU and the chancellor recognize there will be areas of consultation and decision making in which one party or the other will have primary responsibility. In the case of the faculty, primacy includes academic programs, curricula, methods of instruction, and areas of student life that directly relate to the educational process. In these areas the ASCSU is the formal policy-recommending body on systemwide academic and curricular policy and matters that directly
impact them; it is also the primary consultative body on the academic implications of systemwide fiscal decisions.vi The authority of the faculty in these areas derives from its recognized expertise in academic matters. The chancellor maintains administrative responsibility for the institution. The chancellor shares responsibility for the defining and attaining of systemwide goals, which may include goals for the educational program, and the communication that links all components. In the case of academic policy, proposals for changes in policy or for new policy may arise from academic administrators.vii Both parties accept the fiduciary and governing authority of the Board of Trustees of the California State University ultimately to set policy. For the CSU, consultation must take place with the ASCSU in areas of faculty primacy described above. This primacy means the faculty voice is given the greatest weight, although the authority for the final decision resides in the Office of the Chancellor. In areas of faculty primacy, recommendations of the faculty are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons.viii

Consultation and mutual respect are key components of shared governance. Effective consultation and joint decision making result in decisions that better serve the CSU and its students. While discussions may take place in different forms with other constituencies, faculty consultation means that there is an established process of deliberation that offers a means for the faculty—either as a whole or through authorized representatives—to develop and provide formal input in advance of decision making on the particular issue under consideration. System level policy affecting faculty primacy areas shall result from consultation between the chancellor and the ASCSU. Joint decision making in these areas results from effective consultation, as characterized below. While the ASCSU serves as the official voice of the faculty on systemwide issues, campus senates serve as the official voice of their respective faculty. Consistent with the precepts of this document, but not expressly addressed herein, campuses have their own relationships with the Office of the Chancellor. A normative culture of meaningful consultation must be characterized by:

- openness and transparency;
- commitment to civility, integrity, respect and open communication;
- mutual responsibility for decisions;
- trust, including trust of good intentions;
- a commitment to responsible participation on the part of all parties;
- a respect for evidence-based deliberation;
• a recognition of established best practices and promising new data-driven practices in the evaluation of subjects under consideration; and
• a recognition that consultation must allow both parties the time to consider, debate, develop their responses and work toward consensus while recognizing the need to proceed in a timely manner.

In accordance with the above described culture of consultation, any plan or policy that could affect faculty primacy areas and that may actually or potentially result in an executive order, shall be provided in draft form to the ASCSU body (or Executive Committee if during the summer), allowing for a reasonable review period (normally expected to approximate 75 days). If requested by the Executive Committee, additional extensions to obtain feedback may be authorized by mutual agreement. Each party recognizes that there will be occasional circumstances in which time constraints do not allow for normal systems of consultation to work effectively. The formal consultation process will therefore make provision to allow for an explicit agreement between the ASCSU and the chancellor to engage in a mutually agreed-upon process of expedited consultation in such cases, while still recognizing the formal role of the academic senates as the faculty voice on the matters under consideration. In the unlikely event that agreement cannot be reached, the chancellor will decide. Because an expedited process is not the most optimal form of consultation and shortchanges a robust shared governance process, its use should be limited to those rare circumstances that justify departing from the more comprehensive process intended by this document.

Ultimately, genuine consultation based on sound reasoning occurs only in such a time and manner that each party has a reasonable opportunity to affect the decision being made.

[3]

Academic Senate CSU
Academic Affairs (AA) Committee
MINUTES
Wednesday, September 5, 2018; 11:00am-5:00pm
Coronado Room, CSU Chancellor’s Office, Long Beach, CA
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Academic_Affairs/index.shtml

1. Welcome; Call to Order; Introductions
Introductions from Senators Creadon, LoCasio, Millar, Rodan, Schlievert (Vice Chair), Trevisan, Urey, Yee-Melichar (Chair), AVP Wrynn, and AVP Minor.

2. Approval of Agenda
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/academic_affairs/agendas.shtml
Approved as noted with changes/additions: Update letterhead to include Senator Rodan, add 5.2 Other, add 10.1 New program to permit students to take an online class at another campus (AVC Hanley); 10.2 Course Hero – Request for action on infringement of faculty intellectual property (AVC Hanley); 10.3 SARA- State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (AVC Thomas).

3. Review of AA Committee Annual Report 2017-2018
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/Academic_Affairs/meetings.shtml
After review, the committee suggestions included expanding the definition of curriculum, presenting the Cal Grant B resolution in November, clarifying the International Education changes with AVC Van Cleve, revising the quality quantitative data and methods resolution, and reviewing GI 2025. We need volunteers for these tasks.

4. Campus and Member Announcements
There was a question about campus G.W. changes. WASC would review these and ask for evidence.
GEAC will query and collect “best practices” data.
There is a loss of institutional knowledge with all the new hires—both faculty and administration.
San Francisco State is in the process of developing an academic master plan.

5. Chair’s Report
   5.1 Extended Executive Committee meetings
   The ASCSU budget for this year is “flat.”
The academic conference was not funded, and AVC Wrynn added that there had not been a request for funding.
Each senator was asked to contribute $40 for the social fund.
AA is responsible for the ASCSU Social in November 2018.
Exec will ask why it takes so long for the CO to respond to ASCSU resolutions
CFA Workshop on Unconscious Bias will be included in the November or January Plenary.
   5.2 Other
   Review ASCSU meetings calendar, resolution template, insure Dropbox access, and sign in.
6. Liaison and Systemwide Committee and Task Force Reports
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Committees/SystemwideCommList.shtml

6.1. Chancellor's Office (CO) Liaisons
AVC Alison Wrynn: 2018 CSU ITL Summer Academy; EO 1100 (revised) update; etc.

Dr. Wrynn reported on the Summer Academy where 105 attendees engaged in discussions about equity, teaching, assets-based focus, and funds of knowledge, with contributions from the Center for Urban Education.

She reviewed GI 2025.

She is working with campuses that have extensions for EO 1100 (revised).

(See Dr. Wrynn's notes below.)

The topic for this summer's ITL Summer Academy was "Equity-Minded Teaching for First-Year Learning."

- It was facilitated by the Center for Urban Education of the University of Southern California Rossier School of Education, under the direction of Estela Bensimon.
- 105 faculty (including some administrators and 5 statewide senators) attended. All 23 campuses were represented.

CUE's approach to equity-mindedness is to acknowledge the influence of race on

- course content
- how learning is facilitated
- the relationships faculty, administrators, and staff develop with students
- rules and policies in the classroom
- and teaching values and beliefs.

Institute was structured to highlight things faculty can do at the course-level to reduce inequitable educational outcomes.

The **first day** focused on examining everyday teaching practices that can inadvertently create barriers to student belonging and success. Sessions addressed

- examining disaggregated data to make unequal outcomes visible
- learning to recognize and address racial microaggressions in educational spaces (which can make for uncomfortable moments)
- reframing the syllabus as a tool for racial equity (because policies and tone communicate who faculty are and how they think about students).

The **second day** focused on taking an assets-based approach to student learning.

- Day began with Milagros Castillo-Montoya (University of Connecticut) sharing research on students' funds of knowledge.
- Sessions focused on anchoring teaching in fundamental disciplinary principles and designing learning activities so that students can connect key principles to the knowledge they bring from their experience and their communities.

CUE's evaluation indicated that

- 99% of participants strongly agree or agree that they will use what they learning to inform their teaching.
• 96% of participants indicated that their understanding of students’ funds of knowledge increased.
CUE’s evaluation, along with an additional ITL evaluation, indicates that the participants have strong interest in racial equity and equity-minded teaching. Overall, participants understand equity. They would like more practice addressing inequity in teaching and learning.

• Majority strongly agree that race influences content, how learning is facilitated, and relationships in the classroom.
• At the same time, the majority agree (as opposed to strongly agree) that they are confident in their ability to adjust practices their practices to produce more equitable outcomes.
  o For example, participants were more likely to agree than strongly agree that they are confident in their ability to address microaggressions in the classroom.
  o Similarly, they were more likely to agree than strongly agree that they can connect fundamental principles in their discipline to students’ funds of knowledge.
• Several faculty contacted CUE for more resources in the weeks following the institute.

Follow-Up

• One of the breakout sessions at the GI 2025 Symposium is entitled “Actually Achieving Equity,” and it will be led by Frank Harris and Luke Wood, directors of the Community College Equity Assessment Lab at San Diego State University.
• ITL will work with campus faculty development centers to invite faculty who participated in the summer academy to view the livestream of the session.

AVC James Minor: 2018 CSU FILA; GI 2025 update; EO 1110 update; etc.
Dr. Minor presented results from campuses that implemented early non-remedial credit bearing courses as face-to-face summer offerings. The pass rate was over 80%. These students would have been required to enroll in 1-2 remedial courses in the past. Furthermore, students in pre-calculus offerings passed at 74%. WestEd is collecting qualitative data, not making inferences. Sites visited were East Bay, Fullerton, Monterey Bay, and San Marcos.
There is a four-tier placement system.
There is money for GI 2025, with re-occurring money as well as additional money from the Chancellor’s Office. “Money is there.”
Dr. Minor is “optimistic and positive”.
(See Dr. Minor’s notes attached below.)
James T. Minor note from Academic Affairs Committee Report September 05, 2018

1. AVC Minor reiterated the interest and commitment to on-going consultation and engagement regarding the WestEd implementation studies. Minor deferred to the APEP and AA committee chairs to determine the frequency of discussion on this item.
2. Faculty Innovation and Leadership Awards Press Release

https://www2.calstate.edu/csusystem/news/Pages/26-CSU-Faculty-Recognized-for-Innovative-Practices-Improving-Student-Achievement.aspx

Campuses participating in WedEd site visits Summer 2018: East Bay, Fullerton, Monterey Bay, San Marcos.


4. Early Start 2018 results reporting from: Fullerton, Stanislaus, Los Angeles

5. State Budget and One-time funding memos


6.2. Executive Committee (ExComm) Liaison Jodie Ullman: GE Taskforce; Shared Governance; etc.
Senator Ullman told the committee that the April 19, 2019 meeting scheduled for Sacramento will be on Zoom because it was not funded.
A first reading of the Shared Governance Tenets will return to the Plenary on Friday (9-7-18).
The Chancellor’s Office response to resolutions needs to occur more quickly.
Senator Ullman met with Jeff Gold about examples of data analysis. She ran data again.
At the Executive Retreat, they discussed equity and the Student Success white paper. Can we operationalize the definition of student success?

6.3. CSU Center for Community Engagement (CCE)
Judy Botelho: CCE update; CSU ITL proposal for resolution in observing CCE’s 20th Anniversary and success in student service learning and community partnerships.
Ms. Botelho described CCE as advocacy, innovation, and leadership.
Original support from ASCSU was in 2000.
"Is there a “sweet spot” on campus for the number of hours?"
She distributed a brochure about the Research Findings from a System-wide STEM Service-Learning Study.
There is a need for more lower-division service learning courses as well as for a common definition and system-wide attributes.
There are ways to streamline risk management process.
Is this a part of student success and a possible project for AA?

6.4. Course Identification Numbering Project (C-ID)
James LoCascio advised that there is a need for more reviewers.
6.5. Disabilities Advisory Committee  
  Gwen Urey (Report at next meeting)
6.6. English Council Liaison  
  Mary Ann Creadon discussed reading collaboration and graduation requirements.
6.7. Commission on Extended University  
  Jeffrey Reeder is on sabbatical.
6.8. General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC)  
  Mary Ann Creadon, Susan Schlievert, Cynthia Trevisan, Darlene Yee-Melichar  
  GEAC will look at best practices, external exams, Guiding Notes, SB1071, and  
  changes in World History;
6.9. General Education Taskforce  
  Mary Ann Creadon, Darlene Yee-Melcher (This will be presented by Jodie Ullman  
  at the Plenary)
6.10. Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) Advisory Board  
  Nola Butler-Byrd, Jeffrey Reeder, Darlene Yee-Melcher (See 6.3.)
6.11. Joint Graduate Board  
  Susan Schlievert stated that there has not been a meeting, and one would be  
  scheduled if needed.
6.12. Math Council Liaison  
  Cynthia Trevisan said that the council will meet in Chico on October 26.
6.13. SB 1440 Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC)  
  James LoCascio (Report at next meeting)
6.14. Student Health Services Advisory Committee  
  James LoCascio, Darlene Yee-Melcher  
  The committee met in June. There are not enough counselors, and there are  
  salary and insurance issues.
6.15. Student Information Systems and Services Committee (SISS)  
  Janet Millar (Report at next meeting)
6.16. Student Mental Health Services Advisory Committee  
  Nola Butler-Byrd, Janet Millar (Report at next meeting)
6.17. Summer Arts Advisory Council  
  Susan Schlievert attended some presentations and shared observations about  
  the collaboration, camaraderie, and excitement of the attendees.
6.18. Campus as Living Lab (CALL) – Sustainability Committee  
  Gwen Urey (Report at the next meeting)

7. Review of Chancellor's Office Response to ASCSU Resolutions  
  http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/co_response/index.shtml  
  The Student Success White Paper was an "important contribution." Can we  
  continue and add to this?  
  The work on SUGs is in progress.  
  There was a generous financial response to the AA/APEP Professional Development  
  for English 1100 resolution.  
  "We speak through resolutions."

8. Resolutions  
  http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/  
  A template is in Dropbox.
9. **Discussion Items (see Dropbox for materials)**

9.1 Proposed Resolution on “Cal Grant B Program”: James LoCascio
This will be forwarded to the Plenary for November action.

9.2 Proposed Resolution on “Support of Quality Quantitative Data and Methods”: Jodie Ullman
Senator Rodan will revise this resolution for review.

9.3 Proposed Resolution on “Observing the 20th Anniversary of the CSU Center for Community Engagement and CSU Student Success in Service Learning and Community Partnerships”: Darlene Yee-Melcher presented a proposed resolution that was discussed, voted on, and sent for first reading.

9.4 The Neglected College Race Gap: Racial Disparities among College Completers:
Nola Butler-Byrd (Report at the next meeting)

9.5 California is creating one big online community college: Susan Schlievert
Overview of the California Online Community College, the 115th community college in California, with courses starting in 2019. The target is the 2.5 million “stranded students” (adults who are unable to attend in person) in California. There is a current search for CEO. The initial focus is on workforce training/education, especially in the areas of medical coding, information technology, and supervisory positions.

10. **New Business**
AVC Minor recognized Chair Yee-Melichar for co-chairing the Faculty Innovation and Leadership Awards Selection Committee.
AVC Gerry Hanley responded to questions about on-line courses. He said that it has always been done---but on paper. AB 386 required the reduction of searching for on-line courses by students. For fully on-line courses, students need to see the offerings for courses. Campuses maintain eligibility. “We are leveraging existing campus iterations.” What seats are available at late registration?
The summer “Finish Faster” is usually through Extended Education and CCC. Courses listings are searchable.

He addressed the Course Hero infringement of faculty intellectual property, where courses documents are uploaded without permission. His advice was to make one’s position clear in the Syllabus. (You do not have the right to copy, send, etc.) It is a breach, because the professor has implicit copyright. He referred to Creative Commons License.

“Would a monthly Webinar about licensing be useful?”
Campus ALS directors have information, too.

AVC Sheila Thomas responded to questions about the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement (SARA) regulations for interstate distance education. CA is not a member. Campuses must be authorized in another state to accept students. SB 634 “fizzled,” and there is no current interest in the CA legislature. There is a SharePoint site and waivers.
11. **Adjournment** was at 4:40pm.

---

1 In California, the faculty role in shared governance and the centrality of joint decision making in that process is clarified in the Higher Education Employee Relations Act (HEERA); HEERA was to establish collective bargaining for faculty at CSU to insure that in doing so, traditional shared governance practices are not inhibited or undermined: “The Legislature recognizes that joint decision making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this chapter to both preserve and encourage that process. Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to restrict, limit, or prohibit the full exercise of the functions of the faculty in any shared governance mechanisms or practices.” [https://www.perb.ca.gov/laws/statutes.aspx#ST3560](https://www.perb.ca.gov/laws/statutes.aspx#ST3560)


8 Report of the Board of Trustees' Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, Collegiality, and Responsibility in the California State University. Adopted by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, September 1985.

**Addendum**

This document resulted from a series of meetings between members of the ASCSU Executive Committee (Christine Miller, Catherine Nelson, Simone Aloisio, Thomas Krabacher, and Robert Keith Collins) and members of the leadership team at the Office of the Chancellor (Timothy White, Loren Blanchard, Christine Mallon, James Minor and Leo Van Cleve). The meetings took place during the 2017-18 academic year, and culminated in mutual agreement on May 8, 2018.

The following definitions aided in the crafting of this document:

Chancellor: For the purpose of this document the Chancellor refers broadly to the functions assigned to the Chancellor and the staff who work in the Office of the Chancellor.

The following definitions are used by the American Association of University Professors and the American Conference of Academic Deans in surveys of higher education governance in 1970 and 2001. (1)
“Consultation: Consultation means that there is a formal procedure or established practice which provides a means for the faculty (as a whole or through authorized representatives) to present its judgment in the form of a recommendation, vote or other expression sufficiently explicit to record the position or positions taken by the faculty. This explicit expression of faculty judgment must take place prior to the actual making of the decision in question. Initiative for the expression of faculty judgment may come from the faculty, the administration, or the board.”

“Discussion: Discussion means that there is only an informal expression of opinion from the faculty or from individual faculty members; or that there is formally expressed opinion only from administratively selected committees.”

(1) https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/97F85F15-0C93-4F2D-8291-E0E3DAC00329/0/01surv.pdf
ASI Report
Mark Borges, Chair, ASI Board of Directors

- Buck the Stigma, our mental health awareness week, is currently happening underway. Tomorrow, October 17th, is themed “Looking after YOU,” and focuses on self-care. Thursday, October 18th, is themed “Survive and Thrive,” and focuses on suicide prevention education. Lastly, Friday, October 19th, is the Mark Reuling Volleyball Tournament in remembrance of Mark Reuling who lost his life to bipolar disorder.

- Tomorrow, at the October 17, 2018 ASI Board of Directors meeting, Tina Hadaway-Mellis, AVP for Health and Wellness will be presenting on the Health Services Fee implementation. The meeting begins at 5:10 PM in UU 220. All are welcome to attend.

- We are continuing to register students to vote by the October 22nd deadline so that they can vote in local elections.

- October 29th to November 1st, we are hosting an initiative called Plastic Free Poly to promote the decreased usage of single-use plastic.
Vacancies for 2018-2020 Academic Senate Committees

*Indicates willingness to chair if release time is available

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee
Grants Review Committee
Instruction Committee

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
Faculty Affairs Committee (2018-2019)

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee
Faculty Affairs Committee
Instruction Committee
Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee

Christy Chand, Theatre and Dance Department (6 years at Cal Poly) Tenured
As a recently promoted and tenured faculty member, I’d like to serve on this committee to increase my knowledge of the celebrations and struggles of Cal Poly faculty. I’m also interested in being a new voice toward the charge of updating the university-level personnel policies document, since I now know I’ll be here for quite a few more years. Previously, I have served on the RSCA, Disability Access & Compliance, and Exceptional Student Service committees while also serving one quarter as a senator. I very much would like to become more involved with university-wide committees and I hope this committee will be my next step in doing so.

Instruction Committee

Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee
Mira Rosenthal, English Department (2 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track
I am interested in joining the RSCA committee both to provide a perspective on scholarship within the liberal arts and to offer my assessment of initiatives and activities related specifically to the creative fields. With an M.F.A. in Creative Writing and a Ph.D. in Comparative Literature, I can speak on the unique relevance of creative work to Cal Poly’s mission while also advising on matters related to academic research. I myself maintain a research agenda in the history and theory of translation while also publishing original poems, translations of contemporary Polish poetry, and essays and interviews on the art of literary translation. For the past two years, I served on the CLA’s Cal Poly Arts Student Awards Committee, for which we assessed creative work from Theater, Art & Design, Music, Creative Writing, and Arts Administration. On the RSCA committee, I would be able to help identify areas of creative expression that could use more support in the campus environment, including ways in which the Kennedy Library, ITS, and campus research centers and institutes might further assist faculty in effectively pursuing their artistic agendas. Finally, I bring to the table an awareness of national standards for liberal arts scholarship through my work as a Board of Directors member for the American Literary Translators Association, my active participation in multiple national conferences each year, and my continued success in receiving competitive national fellowships and grants. I would be happy to provide my CV upon request.

ORFALEA COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2018-2019)
Allison Ellis, MHRIS Department (2 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track
I am interested in serving on the Distinguished Teaching Awards committee as a means of offering service to my college and university. I am particularly interested in this committee because of my own personal commitment to teaching and mentoring students, and an interest and excitement around recognizing others for their work in this space. As a new faculty, I have not been a recipient of this award, however I have consistently received teaching evaluations above the area and college average. I firmly embrace the Learn by Doing philosophy in my own classes, and am regularly looking for new insights and innovative ways to bring value to students through teaching. I believe that serving on this committee will be a way to not only reinforce those values, but to expose myself to new approaches and pedagogy, while recognizing others for their work. For these reasons, I would like to express my interest and willingness to serve on the committee.
GE Governance Board
Sustainability Committee

PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES
Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee (2018-2019)
Instruction Committee (2018-2019)
Sustainability Committee (2018-2019)
Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee

Chair – Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Committee
Vacancies for 2018-2019 University Committees

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COUNCIL - 2 Vacancies - CAFES (2018-21) and PCS (2017-20)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WORKPLACE VIOLENCE PREVENTION - (2018-20)

Christopher Woodruff, Music Department (12 years at Cal Poly) Tenure track
I am a heavy user of SLO Transit and a frequent cyclist to get to and from campus. As director for the Mustang Band and as a musician with several local performing organizations, I am aware of challenges faced by athletic fans, concert attendees and students as they arrive from off campus for events on the south or north ends. My interests are in finding and promoting solutions that will facilitate access to the university for the Cal Poly community.

DISABILITY ACCESS AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE –ARB – (2018-20)


SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE – (2018-20)

RESOLUTION ON USE OF CAMPUS FOR VISITING SPEAKERS TO PROTECT CORE OPERATIONS AND PROVIDE TRANSPARENCY

Background
While invited speakers have the potential to supplement intellectual exchange at the university, the core mission of the university is education. One of the core operations on campus is in-class instruction and certain past speaker events have disrupted this activity. In our role as educators we seek to emphasize the priority of educational activities over entertainment-focused events held on campus as well as the need for transparency and accountability for spending on campus speakers, especially given the financial constraints of the public university.

While the University Administration is in the process of finalizing the revised Campus Administrative Policy (CAP) (expected to be approved in Fall 2018), in particular Chapter 100, Section 140 entitled “Use of University Property and Time, Place and Manner,” this resolution seeks to support and expand those policies pertaining to guest speakers and use of campus facilities. The revised CAP states that “use of campus facilities or other property may be subject to a fee and/or require liability insurance or indemnity agreement,” and that when this is the case, persons or groups granted the use of campus facilities are responsible for reimbursing the University, and must assume responsibility for any damage. Additionally, it outlines that event permissions should be evaluated on a “content and viewpoint neutral basis.” Section 141 sets forth “reasonable time, place, and manner regulations regarding the use of University property to ensure that individuals and groups exercising their legitimate rights do not disrupt the educational process or other operations of the University.” Section 146 states that “activities that restrict or disturb the routine business of the University are generally prohibited or closely monitored and as such, may be directed to cease or continue in a different location should it be determined that such activity is disrupting the routine business of the University.” This resolution further recommends that outside speakers deemed potentially disruptive and needing extra security measures be held on weekends when the majority of classes do not meet, so as to potentially reduce security costs and minimize disruption of the educational process.

That mission has been disrupted by recent speakers on campus: In April of 2018, the Cal Poly College Republicans and the Cal Poly chapter of Turning Point USA, hosted an event featuring Milo Yiannopoulos at Cal Poly. Cal Poly ended up spending $46,600 and the CSU spent
$39,600, for a total of $86,200 for security for the event. Security costs included wages and overtime for 17 University police officers, 54 officers from other CSU campuses and 58 officers from other law enforcement agencies. Additionally, Cal Poly faculty and students reported that the event, held in Mott Athletic Center, disrupted classes and created what many felt was a hostile work environment.

The previous year, in January of 2017, the Cal Poly Republicans invited Milo Yiannopoulos to campus. The University (with funds from the CSU), spent more than $55,000 and the city of San Luis Obispo spent more than $9,000 on security due to concerns over protesters and counter-protesters. Furthermore, Yiannopoulos was using the campus tours as a book promotion vehicle, in essence making his own profit from taxpayers’ money. The Office of University, Diversity and Inclusivity (OUDI) and the College of Liberal Arts created a counter-event - UNITE Cal Poly with speaker W. Kamau Bell - which successfully diverted attention from Yiannopoulos, but also cost the university additional money. In September of 2017, Milo Yiannopoulos’ visit to the University of California at Berkeley ended up costing approximately $800,000 for security, including police officers from eight law enforcement agencies and campuses across the state. UC Berkeley ended up spending nearly 4 million dollars for its “free speech week” in 2017. Furthermore the University ended up incurring unreported damage costs when counter-protestors destroyed university property.

While the revised CAP sets guidelines and criteria for on-campus events, it does not address the process by which decisions are made about the speaker applications, nor about budgeting and financial considerations, that is, where the money is coming from as well as the comparative cost-estimates about each event’s potential location and date. Although Cal Poly has been responsive to inquiries, the administration should regularly and promptly make this information public, in order to provide transparency and accountability, in the appropriate places such as the Cal Poly website and/or Mustang News.

WHEREAS, A core operation on campus is in-class instruction; and
WHEREAS, Cal Poly, as a public university faces financial constraints; and
WHEREAS, The revised CAP calls for policies pertaining to guest speakers’ use of campus to be evaluated on a “content and viewpoint neutral basis”; and
WHEREAS, The revised CAP sets forth “reasonable time, place and manner” regulations regarding the use of University property; and

WHEREAS, The revised CAP states that “activities that restrict or disturb the routine business of the University are generally prohibited or closely monitored”;
and
WHEREAS, Student clubs have invited speakers which have cost the university and the city large sums of money for security, and based on other campuses’ experiences, these costs could be even higher; and
WHEREAS, University business has been interrupted by security needs at past events; therefore be it
RESOLVED: That outside speakers deemed potentially disruptive and needing extra security measures should be restricted to weekends, and be it further
RESOLVED: The Cal Poly administration makes public, in a timely manner, the process by which decisions are made about speaker applications, budgeting and financial considerations, and comparative cost-estimates about each event’s potential location and date, and be it further
RESOLVED: This information is put into the public record in appropriate places such as the Cal Poly website and/or Mustang News, and be it further
RESOLVED: The faculty supports the revised CAP, with the resolutions listed above.

Proposed by: Margaret Bodemer, History Department and Carrie Langner, Psychology and Child Development Department
Date: August 5, 2018
WHEREAS, Cal Poly has had significant campus climate issues; and

WHEREAS, The Office for University Diversity and Inclusion (OUDI) posted the Diversity Action Initiatives Document on May 2, 2018; and

WHEREAS, OUDI’s Collective Impact Year End Report was released in June 2018; and

WHEREAS, The Collective Impact Year End Report contains short and long-term recommendations from the three strategy groups (curriculum, recruit and retain, and campus climate); and

WHEREAS, If implemented, many of the recommendations of the report have the potential to improve campus climate; and

WHEREAS, Many of the recommendations involve the need for increased fiscal and human resources; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is the least diverse campus in the CSU System; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is the most expensive campus for students in the CSU System; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has established a number of student fees over a period of many years; and

WHEREAS, These higher student fees may affect the ability of Cal Poly to attract a more diverse student population; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has put human and fiscal resources to advancement and development; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly has established opportunity grants that will support efforts on behalf of diversity and inclusion; and

WHEREAS, The Inclusive Excellence Council will be meeting to review the recommendations in the Compact Year End Report of June 2018; and
WHEREAS, Cal Poly has had success in fund raising in several areas including Athletics and new campus building construction; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly is in the planning stage for the next Advancement Campaign; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate shall endorse the process recommended in acknowledges the acceptance of OUDI’s Collective Impact Year End Report of June 2018 and shall strongly encourage the Cal Poly campus to be involved in discussions of the report; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly shall establish as its highest a priority a campaign to raise funds in support of diversity and inelusivity inclusion; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly shall establish a target goal for these diversity and inclusion funds along with regular reporting of the progress in meeting this goal; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly shall encourage matching funds in order to enhance leverage in meeting this diversity and inclusion fund goal; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly shall establish diversity and inclusion as the theme of the upcoming Advancement campaign; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly shall conduct an audit of all Campus Academic Fees as well as the Student Success Fee and report annually on the uses of such student fees; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Vice President for Student Affairs and the Provost should report annually to the Academic Senate on the uses of all Campus Academic Fees and the Student Success Fee.

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly shall determine whether those fees could be used more efficiently and whether the total cost of the fees could be reduced while accomplishing the same goals.

Proposed by: Paul Choboter – Math Department, Dianne DeTurris – Aerospace Engineering, Ashley Eberle – Career Services, Harvey Greenwald – Emeritus Academic Senate Chair, Camille O’Bryant – Associate Dean, CSM

Date: September 13, 2018
Revised: October 11, 2018
RESOLUTION ON SENIOR PROJECT POLICY

Impact on Existing Policy: Updates existing policy to accommodate a variety of discipline-specific practices and encompasses the University mission. Supersedes resolutions AS-562-01, AS-594-03, AS-683-09.

Background Statement: Configuring capstone experiences that support student learning goals, align with programmatic and University objectives, and account for resources is a significant, yet complex task. The aim of this resolution is to establish an updated, comprehensive senior project policy that accommodates a variety of discipline-specific practices and encompasses the University mission.

WHEREAS, Specific guidelines for senior projects, as outlined in AS-562-01, do not adequately represent existing practices; and

WHEREAS, Guidelines and archiving requirements for senior projects are currently spread among three senate resolutions: AS-562-01, AS-594-03, and AS-683-09; and

WHEREAS, The attached policy incorporates significant elements of all three resolutions; and

WHEREAS, The current designation for senior project courses is non-standardized; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the attached policy supersedes AS-562-01, AS-594-03, and AS-683-09; and be it further, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the university adopt a standard designation for senior project courses across the curriculum, either by returning to the former practice wherein the second course digit of 6 or 7 indicates a senior project course or by requiring that every senior project course has “Senior Project” in its title.

Proposed by: Senior Project Senate Task Force
Dawn Janke, Task Force Chair
Date: September 27, 2018

(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.
Senior Project Policy

The project method has served as the foundation of Cal Poly's curriculum since the institution's inception, and the senior project, established as an integral part of the curriculum in 1941, functions as the culmination of a student's project-based learning experiences.¹ To this day, the university remains steadfast in its commitment to affording students an opportunity to engage in and benefit from an integrative capstone learning experience through completion of a senior project.

All Cal Poly undergraduate students shall² complete a senior project as part of their baccalaureate degree program requirements.

Definition. At Cal Poly, a capstone experience is a high-impact educational practice³ in which students (a) integrate and evaluate the knowledge and skills gained in both the General Education (GE) and major curricula and (b) demonstrate career or postgraduate readiness.

As a bridge from college to career/postgraduate success, the senior project at Cal Poly is a capstone experience with achievable outcomes that culminates in a self-directed final production or product carried out under faculty direction. Senior projects analyze, evaluate, and synthesize a student's general and discipline-specific educational experiences; relate to a student's field of study, future employment, and/or postgraduate scholastic goals; and include an element of critical, self-reflectiveness to facilitate student development and promote the metacognitive awareness that leads to lifelong learning.

Expected Outcomes. While major programs of study shall be responsible for designing specific senior project learning outcomes, all senior projects at Cal Poly should provide an opportunity for holistic, competency-based assessment⁴ that demonstrates a strong foundation in general and discipline-specific knowledge as well as an advanced proficiency in the core competencies of critical thinking, written and oral communication, information literacy, and quantitative reasoning.

Senior projects shall broadly address program learning objectives, which should be well aligned with one or more college and university learning objective, including the ability to:

- Think critically and creatively;
- Communicate effectively;
- Demonstrate expertise in a scholarly discipline and understand that discipline in relation to the larger world of the arts, sciences, and technology;

¹ See Helle, Tynjala, & Olkinuoara (2006) for a comprehensive definition of the project method and project-based learning.
² For the purposes of this policy, the term "shall" indicates required practices, whereas "should" represents nonmandatory, recommended practices.
⁴ While Cal Poly does not follow the competency-based model of education, competency-based assessment practices are effective for senior projects because such practices measure performance on a variety of knowledge, skills, and abilities needed in a specific discipline or future endeavor, such as a career or postgraduate degree. Competency-based assessment protocols invite programs to design assessment methods that ensure graduates are career- or postgraduate-ready by engaging with industry experts to design relevant outcomes. See Bral & Cunningham(2016), Klein Collins (2012, 2013), Klein-Collins, Ikanberry, & Kuh (2014), and Larsen McClarty & Gaertner (2015).
• Work productively as individuals and in groups;
• Use their knowledge and skills to make a positive contribution to society;
• Make reasoned decisions based on an understanding of ethics, a respect for diversity, and an awareness of issues related to sustainability;
• Engage in lifelong learning.

**Forms & Examples.** Senior projects may be research-, project-, and/or portfolio-based; individually supervised or course-based; independently completed or team-based; discipline-specific and/or interdisciplinary. They may take forms including, but not limited to, the following:

- an experiment;
- a self-guided study;
- a student-generated research project;
- participation in a faculty-generated research project;
- engagement in an industry-driven project;
- a report based on a prior or concurrent co-op/internship or service learning experience;
- a design or construction project;
- a portfolio of work documenting the results of creative practices; and/or
- a public presentation or performance.

**REQUIREMENTS**

Specific senior project requirements shall be determined at the department level; yet, all senior projects and senior project policies shall adhere to the following requirements.

Senior projects shall

- Commence when, or after, a student has earned senior standing, though completion of preparatory courses and/or research may precede senior standing;
- Serve as a bridge from the college experience to professional/postgraduate readiness;
- Include clearly defined student learning outcomes that are aligned with program learning objectives;
- Have faculty oversight with scheduled meetings for which specific timelines/outcomes are defined;
- Include a formal proposal and/or statement of intent to be submitted to the faculty advisor;
- Involve inquiry, analysis, evaluation, and creation;\(^5\)
- Demonstrate core competencies in critical thinking, written and/or oral communication, information literacy,\(^6\) and quantitative and/or qualitative reasoning in line with the University’s WASC accreditation criteria;
- Require a process/production and culminate in a final product as defined at the program level;

---

\(^5\) Because senior projects shall demonstrate mastery as appropriate for an undergraduate student, senior projects shall incorporate higher-level cognitive processes as identified in Bloom’s revised taxonomy (see Airasian, Cruikshank, Mayer, Pintrich, Raths, & Wittrock, 2001).

\(^6\) Information literacy is a set of abilities requiring individuals to “recognize when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information” (American Library Association, 1989).
• Include an explicit element of self-reflection (e.g. dialogue with a faculty advisor, a written reflection as part of the deliverable, an oral reflection during a presentation, a self-evaluation form, etc.);
• Adhere to discipline-specific norms of academic integrity and ethical practices;
• Be individually and formally assessed;
• Include a minimum count of 3 units, or 90 hours of work, with no maximum;
• Take no more than three quarters to complete;
• Be assigned grades consistent with Cal Poly's policy on grading.

Note: Senior projects shall neither consist solely of a co-op/internship experience nor solely of a test/exam of any kind, and senior projects shall not be unsupervised.

Departments shall
• Make senior project policies and practices publicly accessible in both the catalog and on the department website;
• Instruct students, when applicable, of the need to comply with the university’s intellectual property policy; policy for the use of human subjects in research; procedures and guidelines for human subjects research; and regulations, policies, and standards for the care and use of animal subjects in research;
• Discourage costly senior projects and/or ensure students are aware that they are responsible for identifying costs and potential funding sources prior to initiation of a project;
• Set standards for group-completed senior projects, ensuring that the number of students participating in a group senior project is not so large as to unduly limit individual experience or responsibility and initiative;
• Ensure the scope of a project is robust enough for students to integrate and apply general and discipline-specific knowledge yet not overly ambitious thereby resulting in delayed time to degree;
• Review senior project processes and assess senior project artifacts at least once within a single cycle of program/accreditation review;
• Determine a process for archiving senior projects, whether at the department- or college-level and/or in collaboration with Kennedy Library.

---

7 With the definition of a credit hour as 30 hours of work, as stated in Definition of a Credit Hour.
8 A grade of RP (report in progress) may be appropriate for the first quarter of a two-quarter senior project or the first and second quarters of a three-quarter project. Similarly, an I (incomplete) grade may be appropriate for a project that remains incomplete at the end of the prescribed period, although instructors are encouraged to consider the positive impact that awarding a regular letter grade may have on a student’s progress to degree completion.
9 Policies and procedures governing submissions to Kennedy Library’s institutional repository are based on University policies pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Intellectual Property Rights, and CSU accessibility requirements. Senior projects submitted to the institutional repository hosted by Kennedy Library become part of university’s scholarly record.
RECOMMENDATIONS

While departments shall establish senior project practices within the context of their specific discipline, curriculum, and pedagogy, they should incorporate multiple pathways to senior project completion and adopt any or all of the following suggestions, which draw upon best practices in capstone experiences.

Senior Projects should
- Be student-directed;
- Begin in inquiry;
- Synthesize and apply prior learning in both GE and the major;
- Involve individualized, independent learning opportunities;
- Include a written element of at least 1,000 words;
- Offer students an opportunity to create new knowledge, their learning legacy;
- Help students develop their professional and leadership skills.

Departments should
- Consider hosting informational meetings for students prior to or concurrent with senior project course enrollment;
- Scaffold the curriculum toward the senior project capstone experience by providing students with the opportunities to build their knowledge, skills, and experiences towards the level of accomplishment required by the senior project;
- Ensure all senior projects within a program challenge each student equally;
- Set the enrollment capacity for course-based senior project programs at 30 or fewer students in order to facilitate more direct interaction between a faculty member and an individual or team;
- Offer interdisciplinary senior project opportunities within a department or in partnership with other majors;
- Encourage students to engage in ethical practices and embrace principles of diversity, inclusion, and equity when completing their senior projects;
- Engage in external review of senior project artifacts by alumni, professionals, and other disciplinary experts.

For additional support, departments should consider
- Collaborating with Kennedy Library to determine an effective archiving practice for all types of scholarly outputs including traditional, non-traditional, and non-digital native born research products;
- Contacting the CTLT about workshops to help faculty develop senior project mentoring practices;
- Reviewing the set of prompts available on the APP website to learn more about ways to design effective senior project policies and practices; and/or
- Referencing some of the sources listed on the attached bibliography before developing/re-designing senior project programs.
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RESOLUTION ON MINORS


WHEREAS, A minor is defined as a "coherent group of courses which stands alone and provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in an area outside of the student's major; and

WHEREAS, A major and a minor may not be taken in the same degree program; and

WHEREAS, The minor consists of 24 to 30 quarter units, of which at least half must be upper division; and

WHEREAS, Numerous resolutions outline requirements for minors and a single comprehensive policy would provide clarity; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopts the attached "Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures – Policy on Minors" superseding all prior policies regarding minors, and be it further

RESOLVED: That, as part of this policy, the Academic Senate revise the unit range of minors from 24-30 quarter units to 24-32 quarter units in order to accommodate more effectively 4-quarter-unit classes into minors.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: October 11, 2018

(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.
Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures – Policy on Minors

DEFINITION
A minor is defined as a coherent group of courses which stands alone and provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in an area outside the student's major.

MAJORS/MINORS
- A major and a minor may not be taken in the same degree program (e.g., a student majoring in history may not complete a minor in history, whereas a student majoring in crop science may complete a minor in plant protection).
- The minor will be completed along with the requirements for the bachelor's degree. At least 12 units must be from outside the specified Major and Support courses.

REQUIREMENTS
- Students who wish to enroll in a minor should contact the department offering the minor and meet with the minor advisor. A student should enroll in a minor as early as possible when considering their path to degree.
- A minor consists of 24 to 32 units. At least half of the units must be from upper-division courses (300- or 400-level), and at least half of the units must be taken at Cal Poly (in residence). An exception is allowed for students earning a minor in French, German, Spanish, or Italian Studies who complete work toward that minor through study abroad; in these cases, at least a third of the units must be taken at Cal Poly (in residence).
- Not more than one-third of the courses in a minor can be graded Credit/No Credit (CR/NC), except for courses that have mandatory CR/NC grading.
- A minimum overall 2.0 GPA is required for completion of the minor.

MINORS/GRADUATION
- The minor should be declared as soon as the student is reasonably certain that they will pursue that minor. A minor is officially declared by submitting a completed minor agreement form to the Office of the Registrar. Once a minor is formally declared and entered into the student's record, progress in the minor can be tracked on the Degree Progress report.
- The completion of the minor will be noted on the student's transcript but will not be shown on the diploma. In no case will a diploma be awarded for the minor.
MINOR SHOULD BE OUTSIDE THE MAJOR

A minor is defined as a coherent group of courses which stands alone and provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in an area outside the student’s major. In contrast to a concentration, a minor stands alone and is distinct from and outside the student’s degree major. For example, a major in Agricultural and Environmental Horticultural Sciences concentrating in Environmental Horticultural Science cannot obtain a Landscape Horticulture Minor but can obtain a Crop Science Minor.

A minor must require that students take a minimum of 12 units outside of their specified Major and Support courses (see definitions of Major Courses and Support Courses at the end of the document).

The 12 units (minimum) outside the specified Major or Support courses must be from

1. Free electives;
2. A list of designated electives, such as approved electives or technical electives;
3. General Education courses (as long as they are not specified as Major or Support Courses); and/or
4. Additional units that do not count towards the student’s undergraduate degree requirements.

Majors in which the majority of requirements for a minor are embedded within the major and support courses shall not grant the minor to their students. The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) will review combinations of majors and minors to identify major-minor combinations where it is possible for students to earn both the major and the minor without taking 12 units that are outside the major. If a minor is not sufficiently “outside the student’s major”, a note will be added to the catalog description of the minor indicating “Minor not open to students majoring in XXX.”

MINOR IS COHERENT GROUP OF COURSES

The minor consists of 24 to 32 quarter units, of which, at least half must be upper division. Twelve or more of the units in the minor must be specified courses with the remainder, if any, to be chosen from an appropriate list(s). The specified units in a minor may include a choice of one course from a short list of courses that have similar content or course learning objectives. For example, the following requirement is consistent with the intent of this policy:

Select from the following (4 units): STAT 217, STAT 218, STAT 251.

The above list includes three introductory statistics courses that contain similar content but are offered for different majors. The ASCC would consider the 4 units in the above example to be specified.

Programs may request an exception to the requirement that at least 12 units in a minor be specified. Exception requests must be submitted to the ASCC and should include a written justification that demonstrates how the courses in the minor enable all students to achieve the
Minor Program Learning Objectives. The ASCC will review exception requests in consultation with the Minor Program to ensure that the minor offers a “coherent group of courses with a defined purpose or theme.”

A proposal for a minor program will include a brief matrix of the Minor Program Learning Objectives provided by the minor correlated with the courses in the minor. This matrix should demonstrate that the minor is a "coherent group of courses with a defined purpose or theme." The matrix should map Minor Program Learning Objectives to courses within the minor such that all PLOs are met. Similarly, the required courses should all meet, at least in part, one or more of the Minor PLOs.

MULTIPLE MINORS

A student may count a maximum of 8 units between any two minors.

NEW MINORS

Because minors increase student choice and do not pertain to degree requirements, a new minor may be proposed at any time. A proposal for a new minor will undergo the standard academic review process and provide learning objectives, demonstrate student interest and need, identify resources, etc.

New electives may be added to a minor at any time, but other changes may only occur during a catalog cycle.

IMPLEMENTATION

Existing minors with fewer than 12 specified units will not be required to request an exception or to provide justification, unless they propose substantive changes to the minor. All minors will need to provide Minor Program Learning Objectives and their PLO-to-course mapping for the 2021-2023 catalog. The Minor PLOs will be published in the 2021-2023 catalog.
DEFINITIONS

As stated in the Cal Poly catalog, Major Courses and Support Courses are defined as:

Major Courses

- comprise the basic knowledge in the discipline and are required of all students in the major;
- have the prefix of the major program and/or college; may be from any other prefix or discipline which are required in the major field of study;
- count toward the Major GPA; include common core courses that are at least half of the required number of units in the major;
- may be augmented by a concentration, minor or adviser approved electives;
- which fulfill General Education requirements shall be listed in the major course category with a reference (as an asterisk) to the GE area;
- should include 15 units designated at the 100-200 level.

Support Courses

- are any specified courses that are not listed in the major; do not carry the prefix of the home department, with the exception of advisor/technical/professional electives;
- are optional depending on the nature of the degree program and the judgment of the program's faculty;
- which fulfill General Education requirements shall be listed in the support course category with a reference (as an asterisk) to the GE area.
Background Material

Cal Poly first addressed minors in Resolution AS-73-79, where it endorsed "the concept of optional minors" and provided a definition:

A minor is a formal aggregate of classes in a specific subject area designed to give a student documented competency in a secondary course of study. In contrast to options and concentrations it stands alone and is distinct from and outside the student's degree major.

Additionally, it set forth that

The minor consists of 24 to 30 quarter units, of which at least half must be upper division. Twelve or more of the units in the minor must be specified courses with the remainder, if any, to be chosen from an appropriate list.

Resolution AS-213-86 tried to provide differentiation between minors and concentrations by stating "in contrast to concentrations it stands alone and is distinct from and outside the student's degree major."

Resolution AS-312-89 called for a study on minors at Cal Poly. This study resulted in a Resolution AS-335-90, which concluded that minors that "presented a clear central theme and justified the choice of courses in relation to that theme were the strongest. In addition interdisciplinary programs were stronger if they included a course or courses which integrated the diverse elements of the program."

The resolution also called for minors to be included in Program Review, and that "a proposal for a minor program be required to include a brief matrix of competencies provided by the minor correlated with the courses in the minor which will fulfill those competencies." Finally, it made minor changes to the definition of a minor:

A minor is a group of courses outside the major with a defined purpose or theme which gives documented competency in a secondary course of study.

Resolution AS-437-95 changed the policy that "A major and a minor may not be taken in the same discipline. Units taken for completion of the minor may not be counted to satisfy requirements for courses in the "major" column of the student's curriculum sheet" to simply say that "A major and a minor may not be taken in the same degree program."

Finally, Resolution AS-775-14 established Cross-Disciplinary minors and had a provision that "the CDSM curriculum shall require at least 12 units of coursework that cannot be covered by the requirements of the student's major."

Between 1995 and 2014, CAM was migrated to the Academic Plans and Programs site (https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/academicpolicies/Policies-Undergrad/Minors). Several of the provisions were not copied over, but no Academic Senate resolutions ever officially retired or replaced the previous ones. The policies on the website as of October 9, 2018 are provided below.
Minors
Definition: A minor is defined as a coherent group of courses which stands alone and provides a student with broad knowledge of and competency in an area outside the student's major.

Majors/Minors
- A major and a minor may not be taken in the same degree program (e.g., a student majoring in history may not complete a minor in history, whereas a student majoring in crop science may complete a minor in plant protection).
- The minor will be completed along with the requirements for the bachelor's degree. Courses in the minor may be used to satisfy major, support, and general education requirements.

Requirements
- Students who wish to complete a minor are to contact the department offering the academic minor as early as possible in the program and fill out the appropriate agreement form.
- A minor consists of 24 to 30 units. At least half of the units must be from upper-division courses (300- or 400-level). For French, German, and Spanish language minors studying abroad, the residence requirement is reduced from 12 units (1/2 of the 24 required for these minors) to 8 units, 1/3 of the total.
- Not more than one-third of the courses in a minor can be graded Credit/No Credit (CR/NC), except for courses which have mandatory CR/NC grading.
- A minimum overall 2.0 GPA is required for completion of the minor. Prior to 3/29/2017, French, German and Spanish language minors must have a minimum overall 2.75 GPA.

Minors/Graduation
- The minor should be declared as soon as the student is reasonably certain that he/she will pursue that minor. Check with the minor advisor to complete the minor form, which should then be submitted to the Office of the Registrar. Once it is formally declared and entered into the student's record, progress in the minor can be tracked on the Degree Progress report.
- The completion of the minor will be noted on the student's transcript but will not be shown on the diploma. In no case will a diploma be awarded for the minor.
WHEREAS, The consent agenda is a tool for increasing the efficiency of meetings; and

WHEREAS, The consent agenda is a procedure where a group of items are approved in a single motion without discussion; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as shown on the attached copy.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: August 21, 2018
ADDITION to Bylaws of the Academic Senate

Section V. MEETINGS

E. CONSENT AGENDA

Items appearing on the Consent Agenda are expected to be routine and noncontroversial. Common uses include, but are not limited to, modifications to departments, courses, programs, and degrees. (New departments, courses, programs and degree must include a resolution and follow the regular approval path for resolutions.)

Any item on the Consent Agenda may be moved to the regular agenda at the request of a Senators within the allowed time. If an item is so moved, it shall be placed on the Business Items of the agenda as a First Reading item. Certain Consent Agenda Items, such as recommendations from the Curriculum Committee or Faculty Affairs Committee, may require special procedures.

Debate is not allowed on any item on the Consent Agenda, but questions for clarification are permitted.

Items not removed shall be approved by general consent without debate.