Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
Tuesday, November 3, 2020
3:10 to 5:00pm
https://calpoly.zoom.us/j/93555157076

I. Minutes: October 27, 2020 (p. 2)

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost:
D. Statewide Senate:
E. CFA:
F. ASI:

IV. Special Reports:

V. Business Item(s):
A. [CLOSED SESSION, TIME CERTAIN 3:15 p.m.] Honorary Degree: Keith Humphrey, Vice President for Student Affairs (Materials sent electronically)
B. Resolution on Pilot Pathways Program within General Education: Gary Laver, Chair, General Education Governance Board (pp. 3-15)
C. Resolution Opposing the Implementation of AB1460/Education Code 89032 (The California State University (CSU) Ethnic Studies Undergraduate Graduation Requirement) In General Education (Title V): Jose Navarro, Cal Poly Ethnic Studies Requirement Working Group (pp. 16-36)
D. Resolution on Suspending Credit/No Credit Grading Restrictions for AY 2020-2021 in Response to Covid-19: Thomas Gutierrez, Academic Senate Chair (pp. 37-38)
E. [TIME CERTAIN 4:40 p.m.] Approval of Instruction Committee’s Recommendations for the 2022-2023 Academic Calendar: John Hagen, Academic Senate Instruction Committee Chair (p. 39-59)

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee  
Tuesday, October 27, 2020  
3:10 to 5:00 p.m.

I. **Minutes:** M/S/P to approve the October 6 and October 13, 2020, Academic Senate Executive Committee minutes.

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

III. **Reports:**
A. **Academic Senate Chair:** none.
B. **President’s Office:** none.
C. **Provost:** none.
D. **Statewide Senate:** none.
E. **CFA:** Lewis Call, CFA President, announced that the Memorandum of Understanding on virtual teaching has officially been extended through the end of the 2020-2021 academic year.
F. **ASI:** none.

IV. **Business Item(s):**
A. **Appointments to Academic Senate committees for the 2020-2022 term.** M/S/P to appoint Dale Clifford, Architecture, to the Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee.
B. **Appointments to University Committees for the 2020-2022 term.** M/S/P to appoint Mona El Helbawy, Electrical Engineering, to the Academic Assessment Council and Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR) Advisory Board as well as Michael Whitt, Biomedical Engineering, to the Intellectual Property Review Committee.
C. **Appointment of Samuel Shalhoub as Part-Time Employee representative.** M/S/P to appoint Samuel Shalhoub, Liberal Studies, as the 2020-2021 Part-Time Employee representative.
D. **Appointment of Tina Smilkstein to the College of Engineering (CENG) Caucus.** M/S/P to appoint Tina Smilkstein, Electrical Engineering, to the CENG Caucus for the 2020-2022 term.
E. **Appointment of Xuan Wang to the CENG Caucus.** M/S/P to appoint Xuan Wang, Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering, to the CENG Caucus for the 2020-2022 term.
F. **Resolution on Emergency MPP Appointments.** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, introduced a resolution that would formalize MPP appointment policies and ensure consultation with the Academic Senate before appointments to positions “affecting areas of faculty concern.” It would also establish emergency MPP appointments as simply temporary and require a full search for a permanent selection soon after. M/S/P to agendize the resolution.
G. **Review and Consider “UFPP Consent Agenda Report 12.3 Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students.”** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, shared a Consent Agenda proposal which details Chapter 12.3 Assigned Time for Exceptional Services to Students. The chapter includes policies and criteria for the assigning of exceptional performance awards, established in The Collective Bargaining Agreement, as well as encourages faculty participation in the awards committee. M/S/P to agendize the Consent Agenda report.

V. **Discussion Item(s):**
A. **Proposed Changes to General Education (GE).** Gary Laver, GE Governance Board (GEGB) Chair, reported that GE may soon undergo more structural changes in order to realign with Executive Order 1100 Revised based on updates in response to AB-1460. The GEGB is working to provide feedback to the Chancellor’s Office about implementation of such adjustments, such as reducing the total number of units in GE as well as adding a new Area F for Ethnic Studies. Laver shared that the GEGB is concerned for not only the workload associated with these major shifts, but also the integrity of GE as a whole with this constant fluctuation.

VI. **Adjournment:** 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by,

*Katie Terou*  
Academic Senate Student Assistant

805-756-1258 - academicsenate.calpoly.edu
Adopted:

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

AS-____-20

RESOLUTION ON PILOT PATHWAYS PROGRAM WITHIN GENERAL EDUCATION

1 WHEREAS, The campuswide effort that led to the recent revision of Cal Poly’s General Education
2 (GE) template included an exploration of a pathways program within GE; and
3
4 WHEREAS, The Pathway Work Group created by the GE Governance Board released its Report in
5 Spring 2019; and
6
7 WHEREAS, Following its review of the Work Group’s Report, the GE Governance Board has
8 compiled guidelines on the structure of a pilot pathways program within GE; therefore be
9 it
10
11 RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached GEGB Guidelines for a Pilot
12 Pathways Program; and be it further
13
14 RESOLVED: Cal Poly use the Guidelines to implement an exploratory pathways program in the 2021–
15 2022 academic year; and be it further
16
17 RESOLVED: That the GE Governance Board report to the Academic Senate during the 2023–2024
18 academic year on the results of this program.

Proposed by: General Education Governance Board
Date: November 3, 2020
GEGB Guidelines for a Pilot Pathways Program

As one of its stated goals, Cal Poly’s General Education program seeks to “promote connections between the GE Areas so students and faculty perceive GE courses as interrelated rather than as isolated fragments.” In addition to the guidelines listed below, we encourage faculty to actively promote pathway collaborations in which they are a part. Faculty members should sign a memo (e.g., through AdobeSign) certifying that the student successfully completed the pathway.

- GEBG will review and approve all pathway proposals.
- All courses in a pathway must be GE courses.
- Courses approved for a pathway will be listed on the GE website.
- A pathway must contain at least twelve units.
- Pathways are recommended to have a core of three courses out of no more than four courses. Special justification is expected for larger lists.
- Course substitutions are not allowed.
- Pathways are recommended to have two or fewer upper-division courses. Special justification is expected for proposals with three upper-division courses.
- Pathways are recommended to include courses from two GE Areas. Special justification is expected for proposals covering only one GE Area.
Mission Statement

Cal Poly General Education Pathways are integrated, interdisciplinary experiences within our GE program, providing students with a curated focus on contemporary and relevant world problems, and resulting in culminating experiences that support the distinct identity found in a Cal Poly education.

Guiding Principles

1. **A Cal Poly GE Pathway is more than just a list of courses.** Pathways are coherent sets of GE courses that are defined by, and designed to answer, one or more compelling question(s). They represent an opportunity to integrate and apply knowledge acquired throughout the GE curriculum via a unique culminating experience.

2. **GE Pathways are faculty-designed curricular experiences where students customize part of their General Education experience and explore an interest linked across multiple GE courses.** Each GE Pathway is an interdisciplinary curriculum spanning GE areas, colleges, and departments. Pathways consist of three Cal Poly GE courses, with at least two at the upper-division level.

3. **GE Pathways are not mandatory and are flexible.** For students, pathways do not create an obstacle to timely graduation. Faculty members interested in teaching explicitly connected GE courses have full authorship of the pathway theme, guiding questions, courses, and culminating experience.

4. **Pathways culminate in a meaningful experience.** Pathways culminate in a broad educational experience where students synthesize their learning and demonstrate knowledge of the pathway’s guiding question(s). Achievement of a completed pathway is represented on the student’s transcript.
GE Pathway Design and Justification

In November 2018, the Academic Senate called for the formation of a General Education Pathways Work Group. This group was asked to report to the Senate and the GE Governance Board with recommendations for a GE pathway plan that would “create a distinct identity for Cal Poly’s GE program,” as well as implementation strategies. In January 2019, the GE Pathways Work Group was formed and began its study of this question.

Our work group recommends the design and implementation of a pathway option in the Cal Poly GE Program. This would be an optional cluster of three courses organized around a common interdisciplinary theme and guided by a set of core questions. Pathways would help lend a distinctive Cal Poly / comprehensive polytechnical identity to the GE curriculum by realizing our current GE Program Learning Objective #3, that students should be able to “[a]ddress real world problems by demonstrating broad disciplinary knowledge, skills, and values in arts, humanities, sciences, and technology.” This breadth across disciplines, departments, and colleges would also help fulfill Cal Poly’s goal, as stated in the “Mission and Values” section of the Strategic Plan 2018-2023 Draft, of encouraging cross-disciplinary experiences.

GE Pathways will allow opportunities for intentional, integrated learning within the General Education curriculum. They would allow for the creation of new learning communities. In addition, pathways would give students a chance to reflect on and integrate ideas across a longer period of time, and also to integrate ideas from different points in their GE coursework. These learning practices would add more value to GE and to students’ understanding of, and active engagement with, our GE curriculum. Completion of the pathway would be notated on student transcripts, providing external motivation and reward. GE Pathways should be designed to answer one or more guiding and compelling intellectual question(s). Fundamentally, these Pathway Guiding Questions would represent learning objectives for each specific pathway. The questions would express the intellectual and important contemporary issues to be studied in each pathway. They also would be included in the catalog description of the pathway, thereby centering for students the intellectual endeavor and commitment involved. The Pathway Guiding Questions would also be used to publicize the programs and to create student interest.

We recommend that Cal Poly GE Pathways consist of three courses, including at least two upper-division courses. Many of these courses will likely exist in the current Cal Poly catalog; faculty should also feel free to propose new GE courses for the pathways. The upper-division emphasis allows the pathway to serve as a more distinct, broad, and identifiable capstone experience within GE than is currently experienced in individual upper-division Area B, C, and D courses (which were originally designed to serve as mini-capstones to study completed in each of these different areas). This three-course format also allows first-time and transfer students equal opportunity to enroll in pathways. The pathways should consist of courses spanning across at least two different GE Areas and two different colleges, in order to help ensure the interdisciplinary breadth that our GE Program is meant to provide. We recommend strongly that the pathways should consist of Cal Poly GE courses only, in order to help ensure that the pathways maintain their unique focus and guiding questions the way that Cal Poly faculty have designed them. We also recommend that pathways be designed with somewhat flexible requirements, as long as all of the eligible courses help answer the Pathway Guiding Questions in an authentic and
meaningful way. However, we feel that it is important that no course substitutions be used (from GE or non-GE courses) for pathway credit.

We also recommend that each pathway group propose their own preferred design of a culminating experience, which will exhibit the student’s ability to grapple with and answer the Pathway Guiding Questions after completion of the three courses. This culminating experience could include essays, e-portfolios, presentations, guided reflections, inclusion of pathway-related subject matter in senior projects, etc.

Design and implementation of a GE Pathways program at Cal Poly will require extensive communication and collaboration between pathways faculty and coordinators, departments, college curriculum committees, the GE Governance Board, the Academic Senate, Academic Programs and Planning, the University Registrar, University Advising, and likely more individuals and offices on campus. This should only be embarked upon if a broad commitment to this support, communication, and collaboration exists. The following sections contain more specific recommendations on the student role in pathways, and how pathways should be designed, administered, and assessed.

---

The Student Perspective

Two foremost principles of our GE Pathway recommendation are that pathways are optional, not mandatory, and that they do not create an obstacle to timely graduation.

Students who matriculate at Cal Poly as first-time first-year students would be eligible to enroll in a pathway after completing a minimum of 45 units or three quarters of instruction at Cal Poly. These students would thus have time to learn about the different pathways, and this would also ensure that they have sufficient time to complete the three courses. The process would be more time-sensitive for new transfer students. In order to be able to select GE courses in their desired pathways, these students would need to enroll in pathways early in their junior year. Advisors thus would need to work, perhaps during the SLO Transfer Days program, to educate incoming transfer students about the GE pathways program. For all students, the application process should be a simple one, handled directly by the Pathway Coordinator.

A successful pathway program must be one where a student accepted into a pathway is given the reasonable opportunity to finish it. That is, it would require that the pathways and associated departments commit to offering appropriate numbers of courses and sections. It would also favor pathways that provided some flexibility within their curricula, where some of the requirements could be completed by more than one GE course. Note that this “flexibility” does not extend to the use of course substitutions, which we strongly recommend against. A pathways program might also present the opportunity to innovate creative solutions for enrollment management in pathway courses. Finally, it should be made clear to students that there is no “penalty” for exiting or not completing a pathway before graduating.

The Faculty Perspective

One principle of our recommendation for GE pathways is that teaching and participating in these courses should be rewarding (and optional) for instructors. The thrill of seeing students make connections across subjects and disciplines is part of what makes our profession as
academics so appealing, and we predict that GE pathways will help make this more commonplace at Cal Poly.

Faculty members who choose to take part in this program would be involved in suggesting existing courses and/or designing new courses for inclusion in the pathways. Faculty members could also choose to provide flexibility within course assignments for pathway students, and would also have the opportunity (as appropriate to the course) to introduce or reinforce the crossdisciplinary connections of the pathway. The student’s role and intellectual responsibility is to follow and think through these connections, and this will be accomplished most successfully when modelled by the pathway instructors.

In 2018, faculty members and other campus stakeholders suggested five different pathways to the General Education Task Force: Sustainability, Migration and Migrants, East Asia, Global Studies, and Food, Culture, and Politics.¹ Several students attending the four GE Design Charrettes in May 2018 also suggested possible pathway themes, indicating rich student interest in such an option.

**GE Pathway Construction and Administration**

Cal Poly’s GE Pathways should be administered by a GE Pathway Committee (GEPC) that reports directly to the GE Governance Board. We also recommend that the chair of the GEPC should be an ex officio member of the GEGB. Elected by the committee members, the chair of the GEPC would be responsible for soliciting ideas for pathways and the courses that would constitute them. The chair would communicate with colleges and departments, and coordinate colleagues from different parts of the university in the process of forming pathways. This communication with colleagues from all of Cal Poly’s colleges will be crucial to the formation of robust, interdisciplinary pathways. The GEPC would also include coordinators of each individual pathway, student representatives, and representatives from University Advising, University Registrar, GEGB, and Academic Programs and Planning. The GEPC chair and Pathway Coordinators should receive assigned time to support regular management and maintenance of the GE Pathways program.

The GEPC would review pathway proposals (as described in the following section), and evaluate them on their intellectual merit, breadth, and flexibility, as well as the commitment by associated departments and colleges to offer appropriate numbers of courses and sections. Pathways approved by the GEPC would be sent to the GEGB for their approval, and then to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC).

The GEPC would also have clear processes for adding courses to, or removing courses from, existing pathways. These proposals would likewise be sent to the GEGB and ASCC for review.

The GEPC would also provide resources to help each Pathway Coordinator determine the appropriate number of course sections to offer quarterly and yearly to meet the needs of that pathway.

¹ However, these were suggested in formats different than the one we are recommending here, and also without the Pathway Guiding Questions and culminating experience that we are recommending here as an integral part of a GE Pathway. *General Education Task Force Report and Recommendations: Creating a Student-Focused and Distinctive Program at Cal Poly* (October 2018), pp. B1-B8, [http://bit.ly/PolyGETF18](http://bit.ly/PolyGETF18).
Working with the Director of Academic Assessment, the GEPC would be responsible for regular assessment of pathways: (1) to help ensure that pathways remain accessible to students, (2) to help ensure that pathway courses support and map accurately to the Pathway Guiding Questions, and (3) to assess student achievement of GE Program Learning Objectives (PLOs).

Regular assessment would allow the GEPC to evaluate individual pathways (or the entire GE Pathways program) and recommend improvements. The GEPC could recommend discontinuation or temporary deactivation of a pathway in cases where assessments and improvements are not addressed, or if student interest and/or program resources decline. Each individual pathway group, led by a Pathway Coordinator, would be responsible for accepting student applications to the pathway, tracking and advising pathway students, and notifying the Office of the Registrar upon each student’s completion of the pathway courses and culminating experience.

Each pathway group would also regularly assess student work completed for the culminating experience, to evaluate whether students completing the pathway were indeed able to formulate meaningful answers to the Pathway Guiding Questions.

**Suggested Pathway Standards**

One of the GEPC’s important tasks will be to evaluate proposed pathways carefully for their interdisciplinary breadth and intellectual rigor, and their eventual approval as a formal program. We recommend the use of specific guidelines or a rubric to evaluate proposed pathways.

Proposal scores or priorities could be assigned in the following categories:

- **Interdisciplinary Nature of Pathway**: Does the pathway span across GE areas, departments, and colleges?
- **Compelling Nature of Pathway Guiding Question(s)**: Will these questions challenge students and lead to rigorous inquiry?
- **Intellectual Justification for Need**: What can this pathway provide our students that other existing programs do not?
- **Pathway Culminating Experience**: Does it allow students to draw on the pathway courses to answer the guiding questions in a summative and rewarding way?
- **Measures of Student Support and Interest**: Are there data from student surveys, PolyPlanner, and/or enrollment in related courses to suggest wide interest in the pathway?
- **Faculty Expertise and Department Resources**: Are departments able to commit to offering the number of courses and sections necessary to sustain the pathway?
- **Scheduling of Course Offerings (Availability) and Flexibility**: Will the different departments involved be able to work together to regularly schedule a sufficient number of pathway courses?
- **Plan for Assessment and Evaluation**: How will the pathway be assessed for student learning, success of culminating experience, course availability, and courses’ fidelity to the pathway themes?

A sample GE Pathway Proposal Form that could be used to collect this and other basic information about proposed pathways is included in Appendix B. Academic Programs and Planning would be asked to create the official proposal form, which should then be integrated into Program Inventory Management.

**Suggested Timeline**

If a Cal Poly General Education Pathways Program was adopted by the Academic Senate in early 2019-20, then we recommend the following steps and timeline:

**2019-20 Academic Year:**

**Academic Programs and Planning** would begin drafting possible policies for reviewing pathway proposals, and would work closely with the General Education Governance Board and the Academic Senate to inaugurate the official process. The Academic Senate would establish a General Education Pathways Committee (GEPC) with representation from: Pathway Coordinators, University Advising, University Registrar, GEB, Academic Programs and Planning, and students. The Academic Senate would also recommend an assigned time policy for the GEPC Chair and individual Pathway Coordinators. (While the GEPC is in the process of being populated with Pathway Coordinators, the GEGB and APP would be asked to assist temporarily with the operation of this committee.)

The GEPC would reach out to faculty via college and/or department meetings, help coordinate between faculty from different colleges, consult with the Office of the Registrar, University Advising, and University Marketing on details of the program, and start organizing possible pathways.

By spring, the GEB and College Curriculum Committees would prepare to receive pathway proposals. Academic Programs and Planning would finalize the pathway proposal process. The GEPC would help pathway groups finalize proposals, while continuing to consult with the Registrar, Advising, Marketing, ASI, and Student Affairs on details. Pathway groups would select Pathway Coordinators, design the Pathway Guiding Questions, draft catalog language, and consult with departments on scheduling patterns.

The Registrar would develop procedures for coding pathways into student transcripts.

ASI and Student Affairs would develop messaging on pathways for WOW for Fall 2020.

Marketing would develop pathways messaging for the Fall 2021 admissions cycle.
2020-21 Academic Year:

**ASI** and **Student Affairs** would educate new first-year and transfer students about pathways to begin in Fall 2021 in WOW.

The **GE Pathways Committee** would assist pathway groups with proposals, coordinating work with **Academic Programs and Planning, GE Governance Board, Registrar, Advising, ASI, and Student Affairs**.

**Pathway groups** would submit complete pathway proposals. Interested faculty and departments would account for pathway courses in preparing their 2021-22 course schedules. The **GEPC** would also receive and evaluate pathway proposals, and then send them forward to the **GEGB** or return to the **Pathway groups** for revisions. The **GEGB** would receive and evaluate pathway proposals, either forwarding to the appropriate **college curriculum committees** and the **Academic Senate Curriculum Committee**, or returning them to the **GEPC** for revisions. The **ASCC** would receive pathway proposals, and then forward to the Academic Senate or return to the **GEPC** for revisions. The **GEPC** would work with **Academic Programs and Planning** to develop recommended procedures for each pathway to track and advise pathway students.

**University Marketing** would institute messaging for the Fall 2021 admissions cycle.

**Academic Programs and Planning** would develop the procedures to phase out pathways or pathway courses that are not in compliance. The **Registrar** would finalize procedures for coding pathways, and for representation in the catalog and student transcript.

**University Advising** would develop positions, perspectives, and messages on pathways, and begin to advise students about the pathways. This would include messaging about pathways directed towards new transfer students in the SLO Days program. The **GEPC** would work with the **Admissions Office** to design and then distribute a summer pathway survey for new incoming students, perhaps integrated with the surveys that are currently part of the Block Scheduling process.

2021-22 Academic Year:

Implement Pathway program.

**GEPC** begins continuous assessment of Pathway program: collecting data on course enrollment and availability, success of culminating experiences, pathway student grades in the pathway compared to non-pathway student grades, exit surveys, etc.

Further Design Possibilities:

The GE Pathways Work Group suggests several other possible innovations for consideration as the program develops:

1. Pathways willing to do so could develop optional extensions that lead to a longer “Pathway Plus” or even to a minor.
2. Pathways could coordinate special events based on their pathway theme or questions.
3. The GEPC could coordinate with the University Writing & Rhetoric Center to design a program by which pathway students could complete their Graduation Writing Requirement via a cumulative pathway e-portfolio.
Appendix A: GE Pathways Work Group Members

Philip Ryan Abarquez (Student, Political Science)
Katherine Ettl (Student, Political Science)
Gregg Fiegel (Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Honors Program)
Samuel Frame (Professor, Statistics)
Bruno Giberti (Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Planning)
John Jasbinsek (Associate Professor, Physics)
Josh Machamer (Professor and Department Chair, Theatre and Dance)
Beth Merritt Miller (Assistant Vice Provost, University Advising)
Andrew Morris, Chair (Professor, History)
Camille O'Bryant (Associate Dean, College of Science and Mathematics)
Vidhi Sachdeva (Student, Civil Engineering)
Cem Sunata (University Registrar)
Carmen Trudell (Associate Professor, Architecture)

The Cal Poly GE Pathways Work Group would like to acknowledge faculty members, administrators, and advisors at the University of Maine at Farmington and the University of Santa Clara for providing information about the implementation and administration of general education pathways at their institutions.

Appendix B: Sample GE Pathway Proposal Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Author</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Year Joined Cal Poly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Pathway Title

*Please include the Pathway Guiding Question(s) and a description of the educational and intellectual value of the pathway.*
Proposed Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Name</th>
<th>How does this course / these courses address the compelling question(s)?</th>
<th>New Course?</th>
<th>Number of sections per quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division Course(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division Course(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper- or Lower-Division Course(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Culminating Educational Experience

Each Pathway should have a culminating educational assignment which challenges students to address the Pathway Guiding Questions by demonstrating meaningful integrative thinking. Describe the culminating educational experience for this Pathway, including how it will be assessed, and the criteria for determining successful completion.

Record of Student Interest

For each course listed above, provide average data that would document a record of student interest in this topic. If the course is being newly proposed, data for similar courses can be used.
**Resources**
Describe any resources, such as technology or facilities, that are necessary to support this Pathway. If these resources must be provided by a Department or College, attach a memo of support from the Department Chair/Head or College Dean respectively.

**Pathway Coordinator**
Assigned time will be provided for one faculty member to serve as the Pathway Coordinator. This person will be responsible for managing student enrollment, progress, and completion of the Pathway. The coordinator will also lead assessment and communicate with the GEGB about the state of the Pathway.

Name

Department

Position

Signature of Support from Department Head

**Assessment Plan**
Each pathway will be required to complete a Program Assessment every three years. Provide an outline for how student learning will be assessed in this Pathway, and how the assessment tools will be used to modify the Pathway curriculum, teaching methods, or culminating experience.
WHEREAS, Governor Gavin Newsom signed California Assembly Bill 1460 (AB1460) on August 17, 2020 and,

WHEREAS, being added to the Education Code SEC. 2. Section 89032, AB 1460 reads, in Section 1 (b): “Ethnic studies are an interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity with special focus on four historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans”

WHEREAS, AB 1460 reads in Section 2 (b): “Commencing with the 2020-2021 academic year, the California State University shall provide for courses in ethnic studies at each of its campuses,”

WHEREAS, Section 2 (c) of AB1460 reads: “The California State University shall collaborate with the California State University Council on Ethnic Studies and the Academic Senate of the California State University to develop the core competencies to be achieved by students who complete an ethnic studies course pursuant to implementation of this section. The council and the academic senate shall approve the core competencies before commencement of the 2020-2021 academic year”

WHEREAS, AB1460 Section 2 (d) reads: “Commencing with students graduating in the 2024-2025 academic year, the California State University shall require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at minimum, one three-unit course in ethnic studies,”

WHEREAS, the California State University’s Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ dated 9/29/2020) on the CSU Ethnic Studies Requirement distinguishes between a “university graduation requirement” and a “General Education requirement,”

WHEREAS, the California State University’s Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) notes: “Graduation requirements are a broader category than GE requirements,”
WHEREAS, AB 1460 specifically requires an “undergraduate graduation requirement” in Section 2 (d),
WHEREAS, AB 1460 does not specify that the Ethnic Studies Graduation Requirement be a General Education requirement; and
WHEREAS, the CSU Chancellor’s Office noted that Diversity and/or Ethnic Studies requirements should be carried out as campus-based university requirements in their Executive Order 1100 FAQ in response to a CSU Webinar on September 29, 2017, and
WHEREAS, the Council on Ethnic Studies represents the CSU faculty experts on Ethnic Studies and oppose implementation of Education Code 89032/AB 1460 in General Education; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University reaffirm the importance and need for faculty control of the curriculum; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University request that the California State University Chancellor and Board of Trustees rescind their modification to Title V General Education changes from Summer 2020; and be it further
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of the California Polytechnic State University reaffirms the position that the Ethnic Studies requirement shall be fulfilled as a campus-based university graduation requirement.

Proposed by: Cal Poly Ethnic Studies Requirement Working Group
Date: November 3, 2020
Assembly Bill No. 1460

CHAPTER 32

An act to add Section 89032 to the Education Code, relating to the California State University.

[Approved by Governor August 17, 2020. Filed with Secretary of State August 17, 2020.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST


Existing law establishes the California State University and its various campuses under the administration of the Board of Trustees of the California State University. Existing law requires the trustees to adopt rules and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of this state for the governance of the trustees, their appointees and employees, and the California State University. Existing regulations require students of the California State University to complete courses in American history and American government or pass comprehensive examinations in those fields in order to graduate, with specified requirements and exceptions.

This bill, commencing with the 2021–22 academic year, would require the California State University to provide for courses in ethnic studies at each of its campuses. The bill, commencing with students graduating in the 2024–25 academic year, would require the California State University to require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at minimum, one 3-unit course in ethnic studies, as specified.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) Ethnic studies programs have come about from students of color demanding them. On November 6, 1968, a coalition of student groups at San Francisco State University demanded that the university institute an ethnic studies program.

(b) Ethnic studies are an interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity with special focus on four historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans.

(c) Studies have found that both students of color and white students benefit academically as well as socially from taking ethnic studies courses. Ethnic studies courses play an important role in building an inclusive multicultural democracy.
(d) A report of the California State University Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies, commissioned by the Chancellor’s office, recommended that ethnic studies become a general education requirement throughout the California State University system.

SEC. 2. Section 89032 is added to the Education Code, to read:

89032. (a) It is the intent of the Legislature that students of the California State University acquire the knowledge and skills that will help them comprehend the diversity and social justice history of the United States and of the society in which they live to enable them to contribute to that society as responsible and constructive citizens.

(b) Commencing with the 2021–22 academic year, the California State University shall provide for courses in ethnic studies at each of its campuses.

(c) The California State University shall collaborate with the California State University Council on Ethnic Studies and the Academic Senate of the California State University to develop core competencies to be achieved by students who complete an ethnic studies course pursuant to implementation of this section. The council and the academic senate shall approve the core competencies before commencement of the 2021–22 academic year.

(d) Commencing with students graduating in the 2024–25 academic year, the California State University shall require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at minimum, one three-unit course in ethnic studies. The university shall not increase the number of units required to graduate from the university with a baccalaureate degree by the enforcement of this requirement. This graduation requirement shall not apply to a postbaccalaureate student who is enrolled in a baccalaureate degree program at the university if the student has satisfied either of the following:

(1) The student has earned a baccalaureate degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting agency.

(2) The student has completed an ethnic studies course at a postsecondary educational institution accredited by a regional accrediting agency.
FAQ on EO 1100 Revised

The following list of commonly raised questions and Chancellor’s Office responses is provided with the release of Executive Order 1100 Revised August 23, 2017. Questions have been received through the CSU webinar on September 29, 2017, as well as ongoing consultation and survey feedback from faculty, students and administrators. A summary of revisions made to EO 1100 Revised appears at the end of this document. All requirements refer exclusively to baccalaureate-level learning.

1. **When do these changes take effect?**

The policy is effective fall 2018 and applies to students enrolling in fall 2018 and subsequent terms who: (1) have not previously been enrolled continuously at a campus of the CSU or the California Community Colleges (CCC) and (2) who have not satisfied lower-division general education requirements according to the provisions of Title 5 Sections 40405.2 or 40405.3. Students subject to earlier catalog years may elect to change their catalog year and be subject to the new GE requirements as well as current major degree program requirements and campus graduation requirements.

2. **Can we delay implementation until fall 2019 to give us more time for the curricular changes we need to carry out?**

It would be difficult to justify delaying the benefits afforded by these policy changes, which increase opportunities for student success and facilitate efficient degree completion. Student-supportive policy changes include:

- Intermediate Algebra is no longer required as the uniform prerequisite for all courses in CSU General Education Breadth Area B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning.
- Approved GE Area B4 courses may now include non-algebra intensive courses such as statistics pathways, statistics for majors, computer science and personal finance, for example.
- Major courses and campus-wide required courses that are approved for GE credit shall also fulfill (double count for) the GE requirement.
- To facilitate efficient degree completion systemwide, 48 semester units\(^1\) is set as both the minimum and maximum for total GE units. Stand-alone one-unit GE laboratory courses may increase the maximum to 49 units;
- To ensure efficient completion of lower-division certification and transfer from CCC campuses, coupled with efficient degree completion at the CSU, this policy clarifies that the nine units of upper-division GE courses are taught only in Areas B, C and D.

---

\(^1\) One semester unit is equivalent to 1.5 quarter units.
3. Can California State Universities (CSU) certify GE completion (either complete certification or subject-area certification) in the same way the California Community Colleges (CCC) do?

Yes, policy now allows certification of lower-division GE Areas satisfactorily completed at any CSU campus. Such lower-division certification ensures that students shall not be held to any additional lower-division GE requirements, mirroring the certification process between CCC and CSU campuses. Upper-division GE courses completed at one CSU campus shall fulfill the same requirement at any other CSU campus and shall be applied toward the student’s residency requirement.

4. What are “Golden Four” GE courses?

Courses in GE Subareas A1, (oral communication in the English language), A2 (written communication in the English language), A3 (critical thinking) and B4 (mathematics/quantitative reasoning) are sometimes referred to as the “Golden Four” or “Basic Skills” courses. They are required for transfer admission to the CSU, and each of the four courses must be passed with a minimum grade of C-, per Title 5 Section 40803.

5. Can a CSU campus that requires a minimum C grade for GE courses, other than the Golden Four, require a student to repeat a transferred GE course for which a C-, or lower, is earned?

No, satisfactory completion of a GE course on one campus shall be recognized as satisfied at any other CSU campus. However, if the course is also required for the major, and the major requires a higher minimum grade, the course shall satisfy the GE requirement but not the major requirement.

6. If the Golden Four require a minimum C- grade to satisfy CSU GE requirements, can students take those courses for Credit/No Credit?

GE policy does not prohibit students from satisfying the Golden Four requirements with a Credit grades as long as the “CR” represents a letter grade of C- or better. However, we recommend that students take these courses for a letter grade as some majors may require letter grades in all required courses.

7. Why are the upper-division GE units restricted to Areas B, C and D?

This clarification of existing requirements reflects the organization of 48 units of CSU GE Breadth, with 39 units in lower-division certification and the remaining 9 units left for upper-division completion. The upper- and lower-division units coordinate with the number of units required in Areas A through E, as shown in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Semester units required for transfer (ADT &amp; full certification)</th>
<th>Semester units required for CSU GE Breadth</th>
<th>Semester units remaining after transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lower-division certification includes 9 lower-division semester units each in Areas A, B, C and D and 3 lower-division semester units in Area E, which totals 39 of the 48 units required. Following completion of the first 39 units at a CSU or community college, the remaining 9 semester units (of the total 48 GE units required) reside in Areas B, C and D—the only Areas that require a total of 12 units each—3 units each beyond lower-division certification. These 9 units coincide with the 9 semester-units of upper-division GE required at the CSU. (See Attachment A of EO 1100 Revised for an illustration of this distribution.)

8. **When should a CSU student take upper-division GE courses?**

In most cases, upper-division GE courses should be restricted to students who have completed 60 semester units or more. This protects the integrity of the increasing complexity of degree requirements, and it conserves upper-division courses for the graduating seniors whose degree completion could be slowed without access to required upper-division GE courses. At the same time, the CSU has committed to providing the courses students need, when they need them. There may be cases in which students with fewer than 60 units may need to enroll in an upper-division GE course to continue making full-time progress toward degree completion. At a minimum, students shall be required to have satisfactorily completed the Golden Four courses (written communication, oral communication, critical thinking and mathematics/quantitative reasoning) before enrolling in upper-division GE courses.

9. **Are there software approaches to preventing a student from enrolling in upper-division GE courses without first having completed one course each in GE Areas A1, A2, A3 and B4?**

Yes, the campus Office of Admissions and Records or the Office of the Registrar could edit the prerequisites for upper-division GE courses to include the completion of courses in GE subareas A1, A2, A3 and B4. If additional assistance is required, you may contact Dr. April Grommo, Director of Enrollment Management Services, at 562-951-4726 or agrommo@calstate.edu.

10. **Is “double counting” of GE courses required?**

Yes, campuses may no longer prohibit the double counting of GE requirements and other requirements. Major-required courses that are approved for GE credit, along with courses and campus-wide required courses that are approved for GE credit shall also fulfill (double count for) the GE requirement. Campuses may not place limits on the number of GE courses students may take from any one department (including the department of the student’s major).

11. **Will the transfer of upper-division GE courses dilute CSU campus distinctiveness?**

No, historically this has not been the case because the transfer of upper-division students from one CSU to another is extremely rare. Of the 419,622 degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in fall 2016, only 463, or .1%, had transferred from one CSU campus to another that fall. Essentially all students who graduate from a particular CSU campus have taken their 9 upper-division GE semester units at the home campus.

12. **If a campus has a service learning, GWAR or other all-campus requirement that is completed as part of GE, can the campus continue this practice?**

Campus-specific requirements such as service learning or cultural diversity may continue to double count or be specifically required within the defined distribution Area requirements. All campus GE programs must conform to the total 48 semester-unit GE program limit (or 49 semester units as described in Article...
4 Area B). Total degree requirements cannot exceed 120 units (or the unit total approved by Chancellor White in 2014). A GWAR course cannot be required as part of GE because there is no upper-division Area A allowed in CSU policy.

Clarification added to FAQ 4/20/18- To further clarify, it is acceptable for a campus to overlay GWAR requirements with upper-division GE courses in Areas B, C or D.

13. If a campus GE program requires a GE Area beyond those required in the EO, does the campus need to discontinue the additional campus-specific GE Area?

Campuses have many options, including moving the courses from that extra GE Area into an existing GE Area, moving the courses out of GE entirely and double counting them as an overlay with GE requirements, reclassifying the courses as campus-specific graduation requirements apart from GE, or designating the courses as major requirements, among other possible strategies. Total degree requirements will need not to exceed 120 units (or the unit total approved by Chancellor White in 2014).

Clarification added to FAQ 4/20/18- For campuses planning GE Area variations, if the plans achieve the intent of the EO to ensure clarity, equity and streamlined graduation requirements, the Chancellor’s Office has supported campus plans to vary from the prescribed GE Breadth Areas or Subareas if:

1. The course is an existing campus-wide graduation requirement (such as language other than English), is not an existing GE Area, and will be double counted within the discipline-appropriate EO 1100-R GE Area or campus-specific Subarea; or

2. The course is an existing Title 5 graduation requirement (such as American Institutions), and it will be double counted within the discipline-appropriate GE Area or campus-specific Subarea; or

3. For the purposes of directing students to take an upper-division course in satisfaction of the EO 1100-R requirements, campuses may add an upper-division Subarea in Areas B, C, and/or D. (See question #14 in the EO 1100-R FAQ, issued on August 23, 2017 and posted online as a living document).

Pre-EO 1100-R campus GE requirements that exceed the Areas or Subareas specified in the EO shall not be required in the campus GE program; however, such courses could be adopted as a campus graduation requirement. The total number of units in each distribution Area and in the total GE program shall not exceed the units specified in EO 1100-R. The Academic Senate CSU General Education Task Force, which began its work in March 2017, may pursue distribution requirements in their consideration of CSU General Education Breadth requirements.

14. What sort of “reasonable adjustments,” as described in 2.2.5.d may a campus make to the required distribution Areas A-E?

One example of a “reasonable adjustment” that a campus might make would be to break Area C into Subareas C1 for Arts, C2 for Humanities and C3 for Upper-Division Arts or Humanities. Students would be instructed to take 3 semester units each in C1, C2 and C3 with the 3 remaining Area C units to be taken in either C1 or C2 (as specified by the campus). This sort of adjustment could also be made in Area D.
Clarification added to FAQ 4/20/18 - To further clarify, the example in the FAQ #14 answer was offered as a way of specifying to students and advisors that the nine units of upper-division GE are to be offered and satisfied only in Areas B, C [and D].

15. Cultural diversity and ethnic studies courses are not specified in the CSU GE Breadth requirements. Does that mean the campuses have to eliminate these courses?

No, campuses can retain their cultural diversity and ethnic studies courses, which can fit within the frameworks of EO 1100 Revised total GE Area limits and GE Area distribution limits. Almost all CSU campuses have been double counting their cultural diversity requirement with GE requirements, helping students to complete degree requirements efficiently. If there are questions about reconfiguring campus requirements, please contact Dr. Alison Wrynn, State University Associate Dean at 562 951-4602 or awrynn@calstate.edu.

16. Does EO 1100-R support campuses instituting additional GE Areas or Subareas?

In keeping with intentions for the EO and with responses given during the spring and summer 2017 consultation, the policy was written to achieve a consistent CSU General Education Breadth structure. Further, systemwide consistency facilitates efficient transfer from community colleges and other CSU campuses, and ensures that freshmen and transfer students are held to the same GE requirements, giving them equitable opportunities for academic success.

Article 3. Premises of CSU General Education Breadth

17. Can a CSU campus refuse to accept a GE course from another CSU (or from a CCC or other regionally accredited institution) if the course was taught online?

No, course modality is not to be considered when evaluating courses for transfer. GE requirements may be satisfied through courses taught in face-to-face, hybrid, or completely online modalities. Pursuant to California Education Code Section 66763, a course provided entirely online shall be accepted for credit at the student’s home campus on the same basis as it would be for a student matriculated at the host campus.

Article 4. Subject Area Distribution

18. Can courses that meet the requirements of CSU GE Subarea B4 have a prerequisite?

Yes, the new policy allows CSU faculty to specify the prerequisites relevant to each GE math or quantitative reasoning course.

Courses in Subarea B4 shall allow students to demonstrate the abilities to reason quantitatively, practice computational skills, and explain and apply mathematical or quantitative reasoning concepts to solve problems. Courses in this Subarea shall include a prerequisite reflective only of skills and knowledge required in the course. In practice, it will be important for students to be advised to take a Subarea B4 course that is appropriate for their major. For some majors, this will require a mathematics class such as calculus, which may have a mathematics prerequisite.

Courses meeting the GE mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirement may include traditional mathematics (e.g., algebra, trigonometry and calculus) as well as statistics. Additionally, GE
math/quantitative reasoning options now may include—for example—personal finance, statistics for specific majors, or computer science, which may not be exclusively algebra based. The change allows students more flexibility in completing their bachelor’s degrees, and more opportunities to apply mathematical and quantitative reasoning to the world around them.

19. **Can any LD GE courses have prerequisites? What about prerequisites for UD GE courses?**

Yes, as described above, the prerequisite shall be reflective only of skills and knowledge required in the course. For LD GE courses, this is typically understood to be completion of high school a-g requirements and admission to the CSU. For UD GE courses, campuses must require completion of the Golden 4 (see 2.2.3 of EO 1100 Revised) as a prerequisite. Campuses should ensure that there are course options within each GE category that do not have prerequisites (other than the condition that UD GE courses require the completion of the Golden 4).

20. **The Quantitative Reasoning Task Force (QRTF) recommended specific GE mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirements. Why are those not included in the revised policy?**

In defining the Subarea B4 requirement, the revised EO embraces the fundamental principles of the QRTF Report recommended definition, while keeping within the language conventions for EO 1100 Area definitions. The Academic Senate General Education Task Force (GETF) may discuss recommendations that fall outside the scope of this revision project (clarification, ensuring equity and facilitating efficient degree completion).

21. **Can our campus have 49 units of GE if we require a 4 semester-unit lecture-and-laboratory course? Can we require 49 units if we require a 3 semester-unit B1 or B2 science lecture course and a related stand-alone one-unit laboratory course?**

Yes, while it is expected that campuses could satisfy the laboratory experience requirement with a 3-unit lecture course with an integrated laboratory experience, campuses may require another one semester-unit for a laboratory experience (class). See Article 4, Area B of EO 1100 Revised for a full explanation.

22. **Why can’t financial literacy or personal finance courses be taught in Area E?**

Personal finance courses that include a mathematical or quantitative foundation are eligible to be certified for Subarea B4. A personal finance course that is robust enough for Subarea B4 will not be broad enough for Area E. Removing personal finance courses from Area E will lessen potential confusion that would result if a campus offered some personal finance courses approved for Area E and others approved for Subarea B4.
23. **Can any GE course exceed the unit count required for a Subarea?**

Higher-unit GE courses may not be required, but GE courses bearing higher units may be allowed to satisfy GE Area or Subarea requirements. Major courses that double count toward satisfaction of a GE Subarea may carry a higher unit than the Subarea requires, but students need to be given the option of completing a lower-unit GE course. The most efficient path to degree completion may be through taking, for example, a 5-unit biology major course that also satisfies the B2 and B3 GE Subareas. Compared to taking the 5-unit biology major course and a separate 3-unit B2 GE course and 1-unit B3 GE course, the student who double counts the GE course with the major requirement would save four units.

24. **Does a co-requisite or stretch course that requires more than three units conflict with the Subarea A2 (Written Communication) and B4 (Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning) limits of three units each?**

There is no conflict because all students are required to complete a 3-unit A2 course and a 3-unit B4 course; but students may choose a higher-unit co-requisite version of those courses.

25. **Why are there no recommended outcomes for CSU GE Breadth Areas in EO 1100 Revised?**

Outcomes are not included in any CSU GE Area within the EOs on GE. Campuses may develop their own student learning outcomes for the CSU GE Breadth Areas and Subareas.

---

### Article 5. Transfer and Articulation

26. **What is an “eligible institution” for articulation?**

Any regionally accredited institution or international higher education institution legally authorized to deliver postsecondary instruction in their country is eligible for course articulation with CSU campuses.

27. **Can CSU campuses articulate GE courses with institutions other than CCCs?**

Yes. Article 5 “Transfer and Articulation” in the executive order refers to the annual CSU GE Breadth and Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) review process that is shared among the CCC, CSU and University of California systems. CSU campuses may continue to articulate courses with all eligible institutions in the same manner they do now.

28. **Does the language in 5.5.2.1 “Limit on Certification on Total General Education Units,” mean that the CSU GE pattern MUST be completed in no more than 39 units (40 if a lab is included)?**

A student may complete more than 39 semester units of GE (40 with lab) for transfer. For example, if a student takes a 4-unit Statistics course for B4 and a 5-unit language course for C2 they are now at 42 units (or 43 with lab). The intent of the EO is that students who want to finish CSU GE Breadth in 39 units must be afforded the opportunity to do so. If, however, a student chooses to take higher unit courses for GE, whatever they take should count towards their transfer.

29. **Can a student transfer CCC courses to the CSU to meet upper-division GE requirements?**

No. According to Title 5 Section 40409(a), “No upper-division credit may be allowed for courses taken in a community college.”
30. Can students transferring to the CSU with an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) be required to take additional lower-division GE courses?

No, a student who transfers to the CSU with a CCC Associate of Arts for Transfer (AA-T) or Associate of Science for Transfer (AS-T) is fully certified for 39 units of lower-division CSU GE and **cannot be held to additional lower-division GE requirements**. ADT transfer students are obligated to complete the nine semester units of upper-division GE courses that are part of the 60 CSU semester units required to complete the CSU degree.

31. What is “GE for STEM” within ADTs?

To accommodate the high number of lower-division major preparation courses required in some STEM majors, students pursuing certain ADTs may be eligible to take GE Breadth for STEM. This allows them to defer taking two lower-division GE courses (one in Area C and one in Area D) until after transfer. See Article 5.3.5 of EO 1100 Revised for details.

32. Which exams may be used for GE course certification?

Satisfactory scores on external examinations, like Advanced Placement, may be used to award GE credit and to certify satisfaction of GE Sub-areas. Coded memo **ASA-2017-13** provides the current list of GE units to be awarded for specified examination scores. The list is updated on an annual basis. In addition, course-based challenge exams completed at one CSU campus for a CSU GE course shall be recognized at all other CSU campuses. For more information concerning credit-by-examination policy, see **EO 1036** Systemwide Admission Eligibility and/or Baccalaureate Credit Awarded for External Examinations, Experiential Learning, and Instruction in Non-Collegiate Settings.

33. Why are courses that have not been taught within a five-year period supposed to have GE status removed?

Concerns have been raised that the number of GE course offerings on some CSU campuses is overwhelming to students, causing confusion when students try to select courses to satisfy GE requirements. The five-year period allows for regular campus review and adjustments.

34. Are CSU campuses required to include students on the campus-wide GE committee?

Yes, it is required to include students on campus GE committees. Additionally, administrators and other staff members may serve on campus GE committees. However, in all cases the majority of the committee membership shall remain instructional faculty.

**Article 6. Implementation and Governance**

33. Why are courses that have not been taught within a five-year period supposed to have GE status removed?

Concerns have been raised that the number of GE course offerings on some CSU campuses is overwhelming to students, causing confusion when students try to select courses to satisfy GE requirements. The five-year period allows for regular campus review and adjustments.

34. Are CSU campuses required to include students on the campus-wide GE committee?

Yes, it is required to include students on campus GE committees. Additionally, administrators and other staff members may serve on campus GE committees. However, in all cases the majority of the committee membership shall remain instructional faculty.

**Need further assistance on EO 1100?**

Contact Dr. Alison Wrynn, State University Associate Dean, Academic Programs at 562-951-4603 or awrynn@calstate.edu.
**Summary of Changes to EO 1100***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Changes the term “CSU GE pathways” to “CSU GE patterns.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Sets the required semester units for GE Breadth at 48 as both a minimum and maximum, while allowing 49 semester units to reflect practice of requiring a 4 semester unit lecture/lab course or a 1 semester-unit lab course on some campuses. Required laboratory units have often not appeared in GE unit totals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>Establishes minimum C-grade requirements for oral communication, written communication, critical thinking and mathematics/quantitative reasoning, per Title 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>Clarifies when students should enroll in upper-division GE courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>Requires that 9 semester units of upper-division GE shall be taken in the CSU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6.1</td>
<td>Institutionalizes double counting for efficient degree completion. Major courses and campus-wide required courses that are approved for GE credit shall also fulfill (double count for) the GE requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6.2</td>
<td>Campuses are encouraged to allow the double counting of the 6 semester units of American Institutions with GE Area D Social Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1.c and 5.6.2.a</td>
<td>Specifies binding completion. Once a GE requirement is satisfied, students shall not be required to satisfy it again, even if the student were to change campus or major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Clarifies that GE courses may be taught in all modalities (e.g., face-to-face, online, and hybrid) formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Removes the long list of LEAP information, replaced with a link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly 3.4 in previous EO version)</td>
<td>Removes the section on entry-level skills and remediation, as this policy exclusively addresses general education and not admission or remediation requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Removes the Intermediate Algebra prerequisite from math/quantitative reasoning Subarea B4 and adds language describing this requirement. Sample course titles are given as examples of the expanded vision for satisfying the mathematics/quantitative reasoning requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specifies additional appropriate course content for Area E (e.g., information literacy and student success strategies), while personal finance is removed from this Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>Adds information regarding GE for students who earn ADTs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>Clarifies reciprocity among CSU campuses for GE courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1.c.1</td>
<td>Requires campuses to provide sufficient sections of GE Subarea A2 written communication and B4 mathematics/quantitative reasoning courses to support completion of these requirements within the first year of freshman enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1.c.1</td>
<td>Adds requirement to remove GE status for GE courses not offered within a five-year period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This chart does not reflect all modifications. For example, stylistic changes, numbering changes and reorganization of elements do not appear in this chart.*
### Attachment A
**Requirements for Lower- and Upper-Division California State University General Education Breadth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Area</th>
<th>Lower-Division Semester Units</th>
<th>Upper-Division Semester Units</th>
<th>Total Semester Units* Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area A English Language Communication and Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course in each Subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area A total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area B Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One course in each Subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Physical Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Laboratory Activity - associated with the course taken to satisfy either B1 or B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area B total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area C Arts and Humanities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one course in each Subarea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages Other than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area C total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area D Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area D total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area E Lifelong Learning and Self-Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Area E total semester units required:</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total GE Units Required</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
Students who transfer to the CSU with an Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) or full CSU GE certification, have completed required 39 lower-division GE semester units. This includes 9 lower-division semester units each in Areas A, B, C and D, and 3 lower-division semester units in Area E. Their remaining required 9 semester units fall into CSU GE Areas B, C and D, and are to be taken at the upper-division level.

*To determine unit requirements at quarter-based campuses, multiply the semester unit requirement by 1.5.
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) on AB 1460 (Ethnic Studies) and Education Code 89032

Meeting the Mandate of AB 1460

How are the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU), campus-based senates, the CSU Ethnic Studies Council and the CSU Office of the Chancellor involved in the implementation process of AB 1460?

The senates (system and campus) are the faculty bodies charged with curricular responsibilities. Education Code 89032 (Section 2.c) requires that “The California State University shall collaborate with the California State University Council on Ethnic Studies and the Academic Senate of the California State University to develop core competencies to be achieved by students who complete an ethnic studies course pursuant to implementation of this section.” During its September 17-18, 2020 plenary, the ASCSU approved AS-3438-20/AA: Recommended Core Competencies for Ethnic Studies: Response to California Education Code 89032, a resolution recommending to the Chancellor’s Office the acceptance of core competencies previously developed and approved by the Ethnic Studies Council.

The development of courses and decisions about their approval to meet this requirement will take place through campus curricular processes

How has the CSU Ethnic Studies Council been involved in the implementation process of AB 1460?

In fall 2019, the Ethnic Studies Council created an original draft of the ethnic studies core competencies. These were shared with the ASCSU, who circulated them to campus senates, then included them in resolution (AS-3403-19/AA) passed during its January 2020 plenary. The Ethnic Studies Council refined the original competencies contained in the ASCSU resolution and re-submitted them to the ASCSU during the September 2020 plenary of the ASCSU. The ASCSU hosted members of the Ethnic Studies Council Steering Committee at the September 16, 2020 meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee of the ASCSU to finalize the core competencies required by this section of Education Code.

As required by Education Code 89032 (Section 2.c) the CSUCO is working with the ASCSU and the Ethnic Studies Council. The ASCSU is the recognized faculty body responsible for consultation on curriculum.

1California's Higher Education Employee-Employer Relations Act (HEERA) Section 3561 b states that while faculty are represented by the California Faculty Association for collective bargaining,

"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 such institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this act 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 including the Academic Senate of the University of California and the divisions thereof, the Academic Senates of the California State University, and other faculty councils, with respect to policies on academic and professional matters affecting the California State University, the University of California, or Hastings College of Law. The principle of peer review of appointment, promotion, and retention, and tenure for academic employees shall be preserved."
The ASCSU reaffirmed its role as the appropriate body to consult with faculty disciplinary groups, such as the Ethnic Studies Council, most recently in resolution AS-3421-20.

Have the three bodies named in AB 1460 approved the “core competencies”?

Yes, the approvals can be found at the following links:

- Council on Ethnic Studies, September 15, 2020
- Academic Senate California State University, ASCSU 3438-20/AA, September 17-18, 2020
- CSU Office of the Chancellor September 19, 2020

What is the timeline for implementation?

The law requires each CSU campus to offer courses in ethnic studies by the fall of 2021. Additionally, it requires that students graduating in 2024-25 and beyond shall have met the ethnic studies requirement. In order to meet campus curricular deadlines for the fall 2021 semester, so that students who enter the CSU as first-time freshmen in the fall of 2021, and students intent on transferring to the CSU who begin at the California Community Colleges (CCC) in fall 2021 are able to meet this new requirement, the CSU must move forward with updating Title 5 and the Executive Order on CSU GE Breadth this fall to allow the CSU and CCC campuses the opportunity to do their curricular work in shared governance.

What about faculty control of the curriculum?

Faculty remain in charge of defining and delivering the curriculum. The CSU has consistently maintained that the development of degree program requirements and academic courses is the longstanding purview of duly elected faculty via campus-based senates and the ASCSU, not third-party entities or the state legislature.

The ASCSU and the Ethnic Studies Council, as described earlier, worked collaboratively to establish the core competencies for the ethnic studies requirement. As is called for in the law, once these competencies were approved by the Ethnic Studies Council, they were presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the ASCSU. These competencies were included in a resolution that was approved by the ASCSU during their September 2020 plenary and then transmitted to the CSU Office of the Chancellor, which accepted these recommended core competencies. The next step in this shared governance process will be for faculty on each campus to revise their campus-based GE programs and approve courses to meet this new requirement based on the core competencies.

What are the core competencies for the ethnic studies requirement?

The core competencies, developed and approved by the Ethnic Studies Council and approved by the ASCSU plenary on September 17, 2020, are listed below. They will be incorporated into the revised Executive Order on CSU GE Breadth, which will be available for campus review on or about October 1, 2020.

1. Analyze and articulate concepts of ethnic studies, including but not limited to race and ethnicity, racialization, equity, ethno-centrism, eurocentrism, white supremacy, self-determination, liberation, decolonization and anti-racism.

2. Apply theory to describe critical events in the histories, cultures and intellectual traditions, with special focus on the lived-experiences and social struggles of one or more of the following four
historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Latina/o Americans and/or Asian Americans, and emphasizing agency and group-affirmation.

3. Critically discuss the intersection of race and ethnicity with other forms of difference affected by hierarchy and oppression, such as class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability and/or age.

4. Describe how struggle, resistance, social justice, solidarity and liberation as experienced by communities of color are relevant to current issues.

5. Demonstrate active engagement with anti-racist issues, practices and movements to build a diverse, just and equitable society beyond the classroom.

CSU General Education Breadth

Why is the new requirement in GE?

The determination that this requirement would be housed in general education is based on several years of discussion. First, the CSU Ethnic Studies Task Force Report, issued in 2016, recommended an ethnic studies section in CSU GE. Second, in the “Findings and Declarations” section of AB 1460, the author calls out the recommendation of the CSU Ethnic Studies Task Force Report that ethnic studies be a CSU General Education requirement.

Finally, during her testimony before the California State Assembly Higher Education Committee on April 23, 2019, Assembly member Shirley Weber called for this requirement to be in General Education. On June 25, 2019, in her opening statement at a California State Senate Education Committee hearing, she once again referred to the CSU Ethnic Studies Task Force, stating: “In 2016, the number one recommendation of that task force was to make ethnic studies a general education requirement throughout the CSU system. AB 1460 codifies the number one recommendation of the CSU task force report.”

Why is the new ES requirement being placed in lower division?

The requirement must be in the lower-division to assure that all students have taken the course and that it does not alter existing ADT and major requirements. By law, the CSU may not increase the units required for graduation. This is particularly pertinent to Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs). The CSU cannot add anything to the lower-division 60 units of ADTs that the California Community Colleges offer, unless it is inserted into CSU GE Breadth.

Can the requirement be met with an upper-division course?

Yes, in certain circumstances it may be met with an upper-division course, but, in order to comply with AB 1460, all campuses must provide lower-division course options in ethnic studies for students. Any campus may offer upper-division courses that meet any lower-division requirement. Campuses should be cautious to not set extra requirements for transfer students. This means that students should not be

2 SEC. 2. Article 3 (commencing with Section 66745) of the Education Code, the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act (SB 1440)
required to meet a GE requirement twice. If a transfer or FTF student chooses to meet this requirement at the lower division, or does so as part of their ADT, they may not be required to do it again at the upper division.

**Why are new three units for the new ES requirement being removed from “Area D” Social Science?**

The CSU Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree requires the completion of 120 units, of which General Education comprises 48 units (39 lower-division units and nine upper-division units). To avoid increasing the total number of units in degree programs, the new three-unit requirement must be reallocated from another area of General Education.

Social Science (“Area D”) had the largest number of units available compared to all other lower-division areas of CSU GE. Although Area C (Arts and Humanities) also has 9 lower-division units, they are split. Three units must be in Arts, three must be in Humanities and the final three units may be in either Arts or Humanities, based on the student’s selection. The addition of a new three-unit ethnic studies requirement will still leave “Area D” with six lower-division units. Additionally, three of the upper-division GE units remain in Social Science.

In July 2020, the CSU Board of Trustees removed three units from lower-division “Area D” and created a new lower-division “Area F;” this is where the ethnic studies requirement will be housed.

**Isn’t “Area D” already met by the two courses required for U.S. History and American Institutions?**

Including the U.S. History and American Institutions requirement in Area D is a campus-based decision. Executive Order 1061 does not require that the courses in United States History and American Institutions both be incorporated into CSU GE Breadth or only in “Area D.” On some CSU campuses United States History is in “Area C”.³

**Will double-counting be allowed? Could a course fulfill the new Ethnic Studies requirement and also complete the American history requirement as specified in EO 1061?**

Yes, a course could meet both the “Area F” ethnic studies requirement and the United States History requirement by fulfilling the learning outcomes for both. However, if United States History meets an “Area D” requirement, the student would need to choose the GE area for credit (either F or D). The requirement in American history would be complete no matter which GE area the student selects.

**Will courses with a focus outside of the United States count towards the “Area F” ethnic studies requirement?**

No, such courses are unlikely to meet the newly established core competencies. In the past, campuses have allowed courses about Asia, Central or South America or Africa to count as meeting their diversity requirement. For the new “Area F” ethnic studies requirement, only courses from the four core departments—that also meet ethnic studies learning outcomes—will meet the GE requirement.

**What is the difference between a graduation requirement and a CSU General Education Breadth requirement?**

³ Title 5 § 40404, or EO 1061 Graduation Requirements in United States History, Constitution and American Ideals
Graduation requirements are a broader category than GE requirements. Graduation requirements include things such as the total number of units needed to complete the degree, the number of units required at the upper division, the completion of a specific set of courses for a major and the general education requirements.

Due to transfer requirements between the CCC and the CSU, there are some graduation requirements that are not required of all baccalaureate students at all campuses. For example, a graduation requirement outside of CSU GE Breadth would not be required as part of the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) and may not be required at another campus. The Title 5 requirement in U.S. History and American Institutions is not in Education Code, as this new Ethnic Studies requirement is, thus the level of flexibility for campuses to meet the requirements is different.

Additionally, including this requirement within GE sets it on the same level as other disciplinary requirements in CSU GE Breadth.

**How will students who transfer from the California Community Colleges meet this new requirement?**

Beginning in fall 2021, students in the CCC will have courses available on their respective campus that meet CSU GE Area F. This will be possible due to the long-standing process by which we approve CCC courses for the various CSU GE categories (and also the US History and American Institutions courses). Courses for this new Area F will become a part of this process. Courses will need to meet the same standards that CSU courses do to be approved for Area F.

**Ethnic Studies**

Is it true that courses included in the newly establish “Area F” of the GE curriculum must be offered by departments in ethnic studies?

In general, yes, any courses in “Area F” will need to have an ethnic studies prefix (which usually means it is offered by an ethnic studies department), unless it is an approved, cross-listed course (see the next question for additional details). For example, a course offered by a Native American Studies department or program, that met the core competencies, would count as fulfilling this requirement. However, a course on indigenous people that a sociology department offered would not meet the requirement, unless it was an approved, cross-listed course (see the next question).

In the CSU Ethnic Studies Task Force Report, as well as in the Findings and Declarations section of AB 1460 and within the newly created core competencies, ethnic studies is defined as “...the interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity with special focus on four historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina/o Americans.” Courses that meet this requirement will need to meet the core competencies developed by the ASCSU and the Ethnic Studies Council. These competencies (outcomes) will appear in the revised executive order. These statewide core competencies will serve as guideposts for the campuses, which use them to tailor their specific SLOs to best serve their specific campus needs.

Is cross listing of courses with non-ethnic studies departments allowed?
Yes. If a course is approved via traditional curricular processes for cross-listing (meaning both departments agree to this cross-listing) and the course meets the core competencies and is approved by the campus GE committee for Area F, then the course meets the requirements.

For example, if a course on the “History of African Americans in the United States” is cross-listed between the African American Studies Department and the History Department, and is approved for Area F, a student would receive credit for meeting Area F no matter which section of the course they took.

Is it true that courses that meet the Area F Ethnic Studies General Education requirement can only be approved by ethnic studies faculty?

No, general education is under the purview of all faculty on campus via the shared governance process.

The new Area F of CSU GE Breadth in Ethnic Studies is not a disciplinary requirement; it is a General Education (GE) requirement. No one category in GE is the domain of a single academic discipline (e.g., biology faculty do not solely determine courses for the “Area B2” in CSU GE). Although courses for this GE requirement will likely come from a limited number of departments, and will have structured learning outcomes systemwide (core competencies), the GE program is shaped at the campus level by faculty across disciplines in order to ensure the richest and most broad scholarly foundation for all students. This is accepted practice, not only in the CSU, but nationwide, and it has proven successful in encouraging students to explore new disciplines.

Please note, however, that CSU policy does not constrain campuses from including additional faculty in the GE or curriculum approval process.

General Questions

Who can teach these courses?

The law is silent on personnel issues. Departments will utilize existing practices to identify and appoint faculty qualified to teach courses based on qualifications determined by the appropriate college and department. Campuses should consult their AVP for Faculty Affairs on this issue.
Resolution on Suspending Credit/No Credit Grading Restrictions for AY 2020-2021 in Response to COVID-19

WHEREAS, the Chancellor's Office, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, issued a communication in Spring of 2020 regarding possible considerations and options regarding Credit/No Credit grading that could be implemented without violating Title 5 requirements or Cal State University Executive Orders, and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly, following the recommendation of the Academic Senate Executive Committee, suspended the 16-unit limit for Credit/No Credit grading as well as the 4-unit limit for General Education Courses in Spring and Summer Quarters 2020, and

WHEREAS, the Cal Poly Academic Senate passed AS-902-20, extending the same policy into Fall 2020, and

WHEREAS, colleges, in consultation with academic departments, determined which major and support courses would be exempt from the Credit/No Credit unit limits, and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly's administration has signaled that most courses will be offered virtually in AY 2020-2021 due to COVID-19, and

WHEREAS, faculty and students will likely be in a virtual course environment because of state and local health guidelines and thereby separated from their typical campus settings for learning; therefore, be it

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE

of

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-___-20

RESOLUTION ON SUSPENDING CREDIT/NO CREDIT GRADING RESTRICTIONS FOR AY 2020-2021 IN RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Impact on Existing Policy: Temporary suspension of AS-479-97/CC “Resolution on Credit/No Credit Grading” during Winter 2020 and Spring 2020; extension of AS-902-20 “Resolution On Suspending Credit/No Credit Grading Restrictions for Fall Quarter 2020 in Response to COVID-19”
RESOLVED: that any courses taken in AY 2020-2021 not be counted toward the 16-unit limit as specified in “Resolution on Credit / No Credit Grading” (AS 479-97), and be it further

RESOLVED: that the 4-unit Credit/No Credit limit for General Education courses be suspended through AY 2020-2021, and be it further

RESOLVED: that any changes to the 4-unit Credit/No Credit limit regarding major or support courses for AY 2020-2021 shall continue to be determined by the individual academic programs, and be it further

RESOLVED: that Cal Poly give students the option to change their grading basis to Credit/No Credit until the last day of instruction, and be it further

RESOLVED: that Cal Poly include a notation on all transcripts about COVID in order to provide context to AY 2020-2021 grading.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: November 3, 2020
The Academic Senate Instruction Committee met this week and discussed the feedback from the colleges and others. The majority of the feedback favored these choices:

- Fall: 2
- Winter: 1a
- Spring: 1
In accordance with Campus Administrative Policy 211 (http://policy.calpoly.edu/cap/200/cap210.htm), the Provost, or his/her designee, proposes a calendar to the President for approval, following consultation with various campus constituencies including the Academic Deans’ Council, Academic Senate Executive Committee, Academic Senate Instruction Committee, ASI, Academic Personnel, Human Resources, Cal Poly Corporation, and Student Affairs.

Currently, Cal Poly is operating on an approved Academic Calendar extending through the end of Spring Quarter 2022. Attached are quarter-by-quarter calendar proposals for the period from Summer Quarter 2022 through Spring Quarter 2023. For each quarter’s proposal:

- Applicable Campus Administrative Policy (CAP) is cited.
- The various options and corresponding considerations are presented in a table format.
- Calendar displays with relevant months are provided for each option. Key dates are highlighted, such as final examination periods and academic holidays.

Ultimately, the calendar for the entire year will be a combination of the selected proposals for each quarter. Note there are three options for the Spring 2023 quarter with both two- and three-day options for spring commencement ceremonies.

By copy of this letter we are requesting recipients, except for the Academic Senate Chair and the Academic Senate Instruction Committee, to seek input from their respective organizations. After receiving and assessing input, the recipients should send any comments and/or recommendations on the proposed options, to Michele Reynolds, Office of the Registrar (mreyno03@calpoly.edu) on or before Friday, October 23, 2020.

After the collected feedback is provided to the Academic Senate Instruction Committee for review, the Academic Senate Executive Committee is requested to make their recommendation on or before Friday, November 20, 2020.

If you have any questions regarding development of the calendar, please contact Michele Reynolds (mreyno03@calpoly.edu).
## Summer Quarter 2022

Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:

- Per CAP 211.1, “Summer quarter should end prior to Labor Day. Spring quarter should end prior to the second weekend in June.”
- Per CAP 211.1, “The need to start the first day of instruction on a Monday shall take higher priority in planning the academic calendar than ending summer quarter prior to Labor Day and ending spring quarter prior to the second week in June.”
- Per CAP 211.2, “Whenever possible, quarter breaks should include no less than five calendar days between the last day of final examinations and the beginning of the subsequent quarter.”

**Note:** The following dates are based upon a 10-week session, the longest possible session, followed by a 5-day final examination period. Actual sessions and their final examination periods will be determined at a later date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2022</th>
<th>Break between Spring &amp; Summer terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>June 20, Monday</td>
<td>July 4, Monday</td>
<td>10-week session: August 26, Friday</td>
<td>August 29 - September 2, Monday - Friday</td>
<td>Labor Day occurs on Monday, September 5. This option allows a Monday start and conclusion of the summer term by Labor Day. Instructional Days = 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summer 2022

#### 49 Possible Instructional Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 2022</th>
<th>July 2022</th>
<th>August 2022</th>
<th>September 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S M T W T F S</strong></td>
<td><strong>S M T W T F S</strong></td>
<td><strong>S M T W T F S</strong></td>
<td><strong>S M T W T F S</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 2 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 10 11 12 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</strong></td>
<td><strong>21 22 23 24 25 26 27</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25 26 27 28 29 30 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 26 27 28 29 30 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>28 29 30 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>18 19 20 21 22 23 24</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Holiday</strong></td>
<td><strong>First Day of Classes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final Examination Period</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commencement Day(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fall Quarter 2022

Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:

- Per CAP 211.1, “Whenever possible, the first day of instruction each quarter shall be a Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum spring quarter) and the last day of instruction each quarter shall be a Friday.”
- Per CAP 211.1, “In calendar years in which the first Monday of a quarter falls on a major religious or cultural holiday, it is recommended that instruction shall begin on Tuesday of that week.”
- Per CAP 211.2, “Whenever possible, quarter breaks should include no less than five calendar days between the last day of final examinations and the beginning of the subsequent quarter.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2022</th>
<th>Break between Summer &amp; Fall terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Break between Fall &amp; Winter terms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>5 calendar days</td>
<td>Fall Conference starts Sept. 8, Thursday</td>
<td>November 11, Friday</td>
<td>December 2, Friday</td>
<td>December 3, Saturday</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Instructional Days = 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>12 calendar days</td>
<td>Fall Conference starts Sept. 15, Thursday</td>
<td>November 11, Friday</td>
<td>December 9, Friday</td>
<td>December 10, Saturday</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Instructional Days = 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2022 Option 1 (Classes start on a Thursday, September 15; no classes during Thanksgiving week)
51 Instructional Days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 2022</th>
<th>October 2022</th>
<th>November 2022</th>
<th>December 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>20 21 22 23 24 25 26</td>
<td>18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Holiday  Fall Conference  First Day of Classes  Common Finals Option  Final Examination Period  Commencement Day

Office of the Registrar  10/12/2020
Fall 2022 Option 2 (Classes start on a Thursday, September 22; no class during Thanksgiving week)
51 Instructional Days:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 2022</th>
<th>October 2022</th>
<th>November 2022</th>
<th>December 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S M T W T F S</strong></td>
<td><strong>S M T W T F S</strong></td>
<td><strong>S M T W T F S</strong></td>
<td><strong>S M T W T F S</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>13 14 15 16 17 18 19</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
<td>16 17 18 19 20 21 22</td>
<td>20 21 22 23 24 25 26</td>
<td>18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Academic Holiday**
- **Fall Conference**
- **First Day of Classes**
- **Common Finals Option**
- **Final Examination Period**
- **Commencement Day**
Winter Quarter 2023

Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:
- Per CAP 211.1, “Whenever possible, each academic quarter shall consist of a minimum of nine (9) offerings of calendar days’ schedules.” For example, there should be nine offerings of Monday classes, nine offerings of Tuesday classes, etc.
- Per CAP 211.1, “Whenever possible, the first day of instruction each quarter shall be a Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum spring quarter) and the last day of instruction each quarter shall be a Friday.”
- Per CAP 211.1, “In calendar years in which the first Monday of a quarter falls on a major religious or cultural holiday, it is recommended that instruction shall begin on Tuesday of that week.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter 2023</th>
<th>Break between Fall &amp; Winter terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 with 1a or 1b</td>
<td>3-4 weeks</td>
<td>January 9, Monday</td>
<td>January 16, Monday</td>
<td>March 17, Friday</td>
<td>March 18, Saturday Common Final Option</td>
<td>Follow a Monday schedule on a Tuesday, so there are nine offerings of Monday classes during the term. Options are: 1a) Tuesday, January 17, after Martin Luther King Jr. holiday on January 16. 1b) Tuesday, February 21, after President’s Day holiday on February 20. Considerations: Can affect part-time instructors with other jobs off-campus (e.g. at Cuesta) and students’ jobs off-campus. Occurrence later in term may affect mid-term schedules. Instructional Days = 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winter 2023 option 1 with 1a or 1b

48 instructional days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 2023</th>
<th>February 2023</th>
<th>March 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 9 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 16 1a 18 19 20 21</td>
<td>12 13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td>12 13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 23 24 25 26 27 28</td>
<td>19 20 1b 22 23 24 25</td>
<td>19 20 21 22 23 24 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 30 31</td>
<td>26 27 28</td>
<td>26 27 28 29 30 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Spring Quarter 2023

Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:

• Per CAP 211.1, “Whenever possible, the first day of instruction each quarter shall be a Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum spring quarter) and the last day of instruction each quarter shall be a Friday. In calendar years in which the first Monday of the quarter falls on Cesar Chavez Day, instruction shall begin on Tuesday of that week.”
• Per CAP 211.1, “Summer quarter should end prior to Labor Day. Spring quarter should end prior to the second weekend in June.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2023</th>
<th>Break between Winter &amp; Spring terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>April 3, Monday</td>
<td>May 29, Monday</td>
<td>June 9, Friday</td>
<td>June 10, Saturday Common Finals Option</td>
<td>Considerations: * 2-day commencement period on Saturday and Sunday Instructional Days = 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 12 - 16, Monday-Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>April 3, Monday</td>
<td>May 29, Monday</td>
<td>June 9, Friday</td>
<td>June 10, Saturday Common Finals Option</td>
<td>Considerations: * 3-day commencement period would occur on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. Would avoid need to start final exams on Friday, June 9. Instructional Days = 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 12 - 16, Monday-Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>April 3, Monday</td>
<td>May 29, Monday</td>
<td>June 9, Friday</td>
<td>June 10, Saturday Common Finals Option</td>
<td>Considerations: * 3-day commencement period would occur on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Would result in need to start final exams on Friday, June 9. * Evaluation day would be necessary on Jun 19 to account for required number of academic workdays for the academic year. Instructional Days = 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 9, June 12 - 15, Monday-Friday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spring 2023 Option 1
49 Instructional Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2023</th>
<th>April 2023</th>
<th>May 2023</th>
<th>June 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
<td>S M T W T F S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 6 7 8 9 10 11</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td>14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 13 14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td>9 10 11 12 13 14 15</td>
<td>14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Spring 2023 Option 2

#### 49 Instructional Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2023</th>
<th>April 2023</th>
<th>May 2023</th>
<th>June 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S  M  T  W  T  F  S</td>
<td>S  M  T  W  T  F  S</td>
<td>S  M  T  W  T  F  S</td>
<td>S  M  T  W  T  F  S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  1</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  6  7  8  9  10  11</td>
<td>2  3  4  5  6  7  8</td>
<td>7  8  9  10  11  12  13</td>
<td>4  5  6  7  8  9  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  13  14  15  16  17  18</td>
<td>9  10  11  12  13  14  15</td>
<td>14  15  16  17  18  19  20</td>
<td>11  12  13  14  15  16  17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2023 Option 3

#### 48 Instructional Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>March 2023</th>
<th>April 2023</th>
<th>May 2023</th>
<th>June 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S  M  T  W  T  F  S</td>
<td>S  M  T  W  T  F  S</td>
<td>S  M  T  W  T  F  S</td>
<td>S  M  T  W  T  F  S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  1</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  6  7  8  9  10  11</td>
<td>2  3  4  5  6  7  8</td>
<td>7  8  9  10  11  12  13</td>
<td>4  5  6  7  8  9  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  13  14  15  16  17  18</td>
<td>9  10  11  12  13  14  15</td>
<td>14  15  16  17  18  19  20</td>
<td>11  12  13  14  15  16  17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUMMER 2022</td>
<td>FALL 2022</td>
<td>WINTER 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Year/Term*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF Days</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30/30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR Days</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21/21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Instructional Days</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51/51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exams</td>
<td>TBD†</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Day</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades Due Day</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Academic Work Days</td>
<td>49†</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Academic Year Instructional Days (F-W-Sp) = 147 to 148
Total Academic Year Work Days (F-W-Sp) = 170-171

Per CAP 211.1: The typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days. From year-to-year a variation of plus or minus two days is permissible. There shall be a minimum of 170 academic workdays in the academic year. There shall be a maximum of 180 academic work days in the academic year.

---

* Fall Conference
† Final exam periods for summer term are determined by the number and length of sessions offered.
‡ Spring commencement occurs over the course of 2-3 days with departments participating in 1 of those days.
2022-2023 Academic Calendar Options
Consultation Feedback

See the following pages for feedback from:

Academic Affairs
  College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
  Orfalea College of Business
  Extended Education

Academic Personnel

Student Affairs
Michele,

The email below includes the input from Academic Personnel. OCOB did not have any specific input over the calendar or options.

Albert A. Liddicoat, Ph.D.
Interim Dean, Orfalea College of Business
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Personnel
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Office Phone: (805) 756-5217   Email: aliddico@calpoly.edu

Cal Poly

From: Chris Blackburn <cblackbu@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 11:07 AM
To: Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>
Subject: Re: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Hi Al,

With Carol's input, we didn't see any issues, but prefer Option #1 for Fall 2022, the earlier start date is always preferred due to the amount of appointment processing that occurs.

Option #2 - fall conference begins the 15th, classes being the 22nd is problematic because that gives us 4 days to complete new hires before master payroll runs for September pay period for those who do not get their I-9's completed before the first day of the quarter. Most new faculty with VISAs don't complete their I-9's until the first day of their appointment. They then need time to complete the Glacier program to determine their residency status for tax purposes to set their retirement codes.

All other dates look good.

Thanks,
Chris

From: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2020 2:31 PM
To: Christine Theodoropoulos <theo@calpoly.edu>; Andy Thulin <athulin@calpoly.edu>; Amy Spencer Fleischer <afleisch@calpoly.edu>; Philip J. Williams <pjw@calpoly.edu>; Dean E. Wendt <dwendt@calpoly.edu>; Beth Gallagher <begallag@calpoly.edu>; John P. Hagen <jhagen@calpoly.edu>; Keith B. Humphrey <humphrey@calpoly.edu>; Cody VanDorn
Subject: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Please review the attached options for the 2022-2023 academic calendar and respond by Friday, October 23 with the proposal recommended by your college or organization.

- You are encouraged to solicit input from your respective departments or organization.
- Request input be provided directly back to you or your designee. If it’s submitted to the Office of the Registrar, then it will be redirected to you for consideration.

The following option has been proposed for the Winter 2023 term:
- Classes start on Monday, January 9.

The following options have been proposed for the Spring 2023 term:
- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Two day Commencement on Saturday and Sunday.
- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Saturday, Sunday and Monday.
- Final Exam week from June 9 – 15 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

See the attached memo for further details. We look forward to receiving your comments by Friday, October 23.

Questions may be directed to Michele Reynolds in the Office of the Registrar (mreyno03@calpoly.edu).

Thank you,
Office of the Registrar
Subject: Re: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Date: Thursday, October 22, 2020 at 4:16:03 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Andy Thulin
To: Michele Reynolds

Michelle,

Below is the input from CAFES:

Fall 2022: Option 1
Winter 2023: Option 1b
Spring 2023: Option 1

Best,
Andy

Andrew J. Thulin, Ph.D.
Dean
College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA

office 805-756-2161
cafes.calpoly.edu

From: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 1:13 PM
To: Christine Theodoropoulos <theo@calpoly.edu>; Andy Thulin <athulin@calpoly.edu>; Amy Spencer Fleischer <afleisch@calpoly.edu>; Philip J. Williams <pjw@calpoly.edu>; Dean E. Wendt <dwendt@calpoly.edu>; Beth Gallagher <begallag@calpoly.edu>; John P. Hagen <jhagen@calpoly.edu>; Keith B. Humphrey <humphrey@calpoly.edu>; Cody VanDorn <cvandorn@calpoly.edu>; Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>; ASI President <asipresident@calpoly.edu>; Thomas D. Gutierrez <tdgutier@calpoly.edu>; Cynthia Vizcaino Villa <cvvilla@calpoly.edu>; Kathryn A. Rummell <krummell@calpoly.edu>
Cc: Jeffrey Dyer Armstrong <jarmstro@calpoly.edu>; Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore <cje@calpoly.edu>; Bill Britton <bibritto@calpoly.edu>; Alison Robinson <aroabin31@calpoly.edu>; James L. Maraviglia <jmaravig@calpoly.edu>; Brian Tietje <btietje@calpoly.edu>; Jessica Lyn Darin <darin@calpoly.edu>; Cem Sunata <csunata@calpoly.edu>; Michele Reynolds <mreyno03@calpoly.edu>
Subject: Re: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

This is a friendly reminder to submit feedback regarding the proposed 2022-2023 academic calendar by Friday, October 23.

See the attached memo for instructions for responding with feedback on the proposals. Questions may be directed to Michele Reynolds in the Office of the Registrar (mreyno03@calpoly.edu).

Thank you,
Office of the Registrar
Please review the attached options for the 2022-2023 academic calendar and respond by Friday, October 23 with the proposal recommended by your college or organization.

- You are encouraged to solicit input from your respective departments or organization.
- Request input be provided directly back to you or your designee. If it's submitted to the Office of the Registrar, then it will be redirected to you for consideration.

The following option has been proposed for the Winter 2023 term:
- Classes start on Monday, January 9.

The following options have been proposed for the Spring 2023 term:
- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Two day Commencement on Saturday and Sunday.
- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Saturday, Sunday and Monday.
- Final Exam week from June 9 – 15 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

See the attached memo for further details. We look forward to receiving your comments by Friday, October 23.

Questions may be directed to Michele Reynolds in the Office of the Registrar (mreyno03@calpoly.edu).

Thank you,
Office of the Registrar
Hi Michele,

Below is input to the proposed 2022-23 Academic Calendar schedules.

Thanks Amy for your input.

Albert A. Liddicoat, Ph.D.
Interim Dean, Orfalea College of Business
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Personnel
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Office Phone: (805) 756-5217 Email: aliddico@calpoly.edu

---

From: Amy Carter <acarte13@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 1:30 PM
To: Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>; Stem Neill <sneill@calpoly.edu>; Kristy Cutter-Rogers <kcutter@calpoly.edu>
Subject: Re: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Hi Al - I don't have too much input...! think there are pros and cons to starting the quarter earlier than usual. The earlier start doesn't give our students with 10-week internships as much time before the quarter starts after internships end...most will work up until the week before school starts. This makes it challenging to do training with student leaders and get everyone back on the same page before Fall but that is a minor issue. The later start date means a shorter winter break so there are pros and cons to both!

Amy

---

From: Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2020 6:04 PM
To: Stern Neill <sneill@calpoly.edu>; Kristy Cutter-Rogers <kcutter@calpoly.edu>; Amy Carter <acarte13@calpoly.edu>
Subject: FW: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Do any of you have input on the proposed 2022-23 Academic Calendar? The options looked fine to me.

Albert A. Liddicoat, Ph.D.
Interim Dean, Orfalea College of Business
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Personnel
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Office Phone: (805) 756-5217 Email: aliddico@calpoly.edu
From: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2020 2:31 PM
To: Christine Theodoropoulos <theo@calpoly.edu>; Andy Thulin <athulin@calpoly.edu>; Amy Spencer Fleischer <afleisch@calpoly.edu>; Philip J. Williams <pjw@calpoly.edu>; Dean E. Wendt <dwendt@calpoly.edu>; Beth Gallagher <begallag@calpoly.edu>; John P. Hagen <jhagen@calpoly.edu>; Keith B. Humphrey <humphrey@calpoly.edu>; Cody VanDorn <cvandorn@calpoly.edu>; Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>; ASI President <asipresident@calpoly.edu>; Thomas D. Gutierrez <tdgutier@calpoly.edu>; Cynthia Vizcaino Villa <cvvilla@calpoly.edu>; Kathryn A. Rummell <krummell@calpoly.edu>
Cc: Jeffrey Dyer Armstrong <jarmstro@calpoly.edu>; Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore <cje@calpoly.edu>; Bill Britton <bibritto@calpoly.edu>; Alison Robinson <arobin31@calpoly.edu>; James L. Maraviglia <imaravig@calpoly.edu>; Brian Tietje <btietje@calpoly.edu>; Jessica Lyn Darin <darin@calpoly.edu>; Cem Sunata <csunata@calpoly.edu>; Michele Reynolds <mreyno03@calpoly.edu>; Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>
Subject: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Please review the attached options for the 2022-2023 academic calendar and respond by Friday, October 23 with the proposal recommended by your college or organization.

- You are encouraged to solicit input from your respective departments or organization.
- Request input be provided directly back to you or your designee. If it's submitted to the Office of the Registrar, then it will be redirected to you for consideration.

The following option has been proposed for the Winter 2023 term:
- Classes start on Monday, January 9.

The following options have been proposed for the Spring 2023 term:
- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Two day Commencement on Saturday and Sunday.
- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Saturday, Sunday and Monday.
- Final Exam week from June 9 – 15 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

See the attached memo for further details. We look forward to receiving your comments by Friday, October 23.

Questions may be directed to Michele Reynolds in the Office of the Registrar (mreyno03@calpoly.edu).

Thank you,
Office of the Registrar
Subject: Re: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Date: Wednesday, October 14, 2020 at 8:56:06 AM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Brian Tietje

To: Academic Calendar

Hi Michele,

Extended Education favors Option 2.

Thanks!

Brian Tietje
Vice Provost
International, Graduate and Extended Education
Academic Affairs
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA

cell 805-423-1847
email btietje@calpoly.edu

From: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2020 2:30 PM
To: Christine Theodoropoulos <theo@calpoly.edu>; Andy Thulin <athulin@calpoly.edu>; Amy Spencer Fleischer <afleisch@calpoly.edu>; Philip J. Williams <pjw@calpoly.edu>; Dean E. Wendt <dwendt@calpoly.edu>; Beth Gallagher <begallag@calpoly.edu>; John P. Hagen <jhagen@calpoly.edu>; Keith B. Humphrey <humphrey@calpoly.edu>; Cody VanDorn <cvandorn@calpoly.edu>; Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>; ASI President <asipresident@calpoly.edu>; Thomas D. Gutierrez <tdgutier@calpoly.edu>; Cynthia Vizcaino Villa <cvvilla@calpoly.edu>; Kathryn A. Rummell <krummell@calpoly.edu>
Cc: Jeffrey Dyer Armstrong <jarmstro@calpoly.edu>; Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore <cje@calpoly.edu>; Bill Britton <bibritto@calpoly.edu>; Alison Robinson <arobin31@calpoly.edu>; James L. Maraviglia <jmaravig@calpoly.edu>; Brian Tietje <btietje@calpoly.edu>; Jessica Lyn Darin <darin@calpoly.edu>; Cem Sunata <csunata@calpoly.edu>; Michele Reynolds <mreyno03@calpoly.edu>; Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>

Subject: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Please review the attached options for the 2022-2023 academic calendar and respond by Friday, October 23 with the proposal recommended by your college or organization.

- You are encouraged to solicit input from your respective departments or organization.
- Request input be provided directly back to you or your designee. If it's submitted to the Office of the Registrar, then it will be redirected to you for consideration.

The following option has been proposed for the Winter 2023 term:
- Classes start on Monday, January 9.

The following options have been proposed for the Spring 2023 term:
- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Two day Commencement on Saturday and Sunday.
• Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Saturday, Sunday and Monday.
• Final Exam week from June 9 – 15 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

See the attached memo for further details. We look forward to receiving your comments by Friday, October 23.

Questions may be directed to Michele Reynolds in the Office of the Registrar (mreyno03@calpoly.edu).

Thank you,
Office of the Registrar
Greetings,

Please find the comments from Student Affairs in the attached memo.

Keith

Keith B. Humphrey, Ph.D.
Vice President for Student Affairs
805-756-1521
humphreyi@calpoly.edu
studentaffairs.calpoly.edu
he/him/his

CAL POLY
Recognized as a “Most Promising Places to Work in Student Affairs” by Diverse Magazine, 2017, 2019, 2020

From: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>
Date: Monday, October 12, 2020 at 2:30 PM
To: Christine Theodoropoulos <theo@calpoly.edu>, Andy Thulin <athulin@calpoly.edu>, Amy Spencer Fleischer <afleisch@calpoly.edu>, Philip Williams <pjw@calpoly.edu>, "Dean E. Wendt" <dwendt@calpoly.edu>, Beth Gallagher <begallag@calpoly.edu>, "John P. Hagen" <jhagen@calpoly.edu>, Keith Humphrey <humphrey@calpoly.edu>, Cody VanDorn <cvandorn@calpoly.edu>, Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>, ASI President <asipresident@calpoly.edu>, "Thomas D. Gutierrez" <tdgutier@calpoly.edu>, Cindy Villa <cvilla@calpoly.edu>, "Kathryn A. Rummell" <krummell@calpoly.edu>
Cc: Jeffrey Armstrong <jarmstro@calpoly.edu>, Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore <cje@calpoly.edu>, Bill Britton <bibbritto@calpoly.edu>, Alison Robinson <arobin31@calpoly.edu>, "James L. Maraviglia" <jmara@calpoly.edu>, Brian Tietje <btietje@calpoly.edu>, Jessica Darin <darin@calpoly.edu>, Cem Sunata <csunata@calpoly.edu>, Michele Reynolds <mreyno03@calpoly.edu>, Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>

Subject: 2022-2023 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested by October 23

Please review the attached options for the 2022-2023 academic calendar and respond by Friday, October 23 with the proposal recommended by your college or organization.

- You are encouraged to solicit input from your respective departments or organization.
- Request input be provided directly back to you or your designee. If it's submitted to the Office of the Registrar, then it will be redirected to you for consideration.
The following option has been proposed for the Winter 2023 term:

- Classes start on Monday, January 9.

The following options have been proposed for the Spring 2023 term:

- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Two day Commencement on Saturday and Sunday.
- Final Exam week from June 12 – 16 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Saturday, Sunday and Monday.
- Final Exam week from June 9 – 15 (Saturday, June 10 Common Final). Three day Commencement on Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

See the attached memo for further details. We look forward to receiving your comments by Friday, October 23.

Questions may be directed to Michele Reynolds in the Office of the Registrar (mreyno03@calpoly.edu).

Thank you,
Office of the Registrar
MEMORANDUM

October 20, 2020

TO: Office of the Registrar

FROM: Keith Humphrey
Vice President for Student Affairs

SUBJECT: Academic Calendar 2022-23

The Student Affairs Senior Leadership Team reviewed all proposed academic calendar options and prefers the following options for the 2022-23 Academic Calendar.

Summer 2022: No recommended changes

Fall 2022:

From an operational perspective, both University Housing and ASI, major facility providers, prefer Option 2 as a start date for the Fall quarter. Campus Health and Wellbeing also prefers Option 2, in the event that Covid-19 testing would continue to be required. From a DE&I perspective, there is concern regarding Rosh Hashanah occurring the first week of Option 2.

Spring 2023:

Option 3 is preferred for the Spring quarter due to University Housing staffing once commencement is underway. Closing of Housing facilities works better with Option 3. Historically, Friday commencements have also been better attended than Monday commencements. ASI has expressed concern regarding the quarter running late, due to internships.