I. Minutes: October 20, 2020 (p. 2)

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. Provost: (p. 3)
C. Vice President for Student Affairs: (p. 4)
D. Statewide Senate: None
E. CFA: None
F. ASI: (p. 5)

IV. Special Reports:
A. [TIME CERTAIN 3:30 p.m.] President’s Report: Jeff Armstrong, President
B. Inclusive Excellence Update: Denise Isom, Interim Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer
C. Evaluation Response Rate: Ken Brown, Chair, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (pp. 6-14)
D. University Advising Written Update: Beth Merritt Miller, Assistant Vice Provost, University Advising (pp. 15-16)
E. GWR Advisory Board Written Update: Dawn Jenke, chair of GWR Advisory Board (p. 17)

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Suspending Credit/No Credit Grading Restrictions for AY 2020-2021 in Response to Covid-19: Thomas Gutierrez, Academic Senate Chair, first reading (pp. 18-19)
B. 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, first reading (pp. 20-40)
C. Resolution on Emergency MPP Appointments: Ken Brown, Chair, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 41-42)
D. Resolution on Pilot Pathways Program within General Education: Gary Laver, Chair, General Education Governance Board, first reading (pp. 43-56)

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
Meeting of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, October 20, 2020

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the September 29, 2020 Academic Senate Minutes.

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: Thomas Gutierrez, Academic Senate Chair,
   All other reports were submitted in writing at the request of the Senate Chair. The reports can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa102020_1.pdf

IV. Consent Agenda:
   - The following college summaries were approved by consent: Animal Science department, Agribusiness department, Military Science department, Natural Resources Management and Environmental Sciences Program Changes – BS Forest and Fire Sciences Name Change

V. Special Reports:
   A. Registrar’s Report: Cem Sunata, Registrar, presented a report on the number of transfer students, freshmen with incoming transfer credits, and updates on block scheduling. He updated the group on the new rules for leave of absence for students.
   B. Ethnic Studies Workgroup Update: Jose Navarro, updated the group on the Ethnic Studies workgroup’s efforts in establishing an ethnic studies graduation requirement. More information can be found here: https://academicsenate.calpoly.edu/task-forces
   C. Annual Program Review Update: Bruno Giberti, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Planning, submitted a written report updating the Senate on the annual program review. This report may be found here: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa102020_1.pdf

VI. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Faculty Choice of Virtual Modality: Thomas Gutierrez, Academic Senate Chair, presented a resolution which would allow instructional faculty teaching virtually to choose whether to teach their classes in a synchronous, asynchronous or hybrid modality while online course review is suspended during the 2020-2021 academic year due to the COVID-19 pandemic. M/S/P to move the Resolution on Faculty Choice of Virtual Modality to second reading. M/S/P to approve the Resolution on Faculty Choice of Virtual Modality.

VII. Discussion Item(s): None.

VIII. Adjournment: 4:27 pm

Submitted by,

Francesca Tiesi
Academic Senate Student Assistant

805-756-1258 - academicsenate.calpoly.edu
Provo's Report | Academic Senate | November 10, 2020

- **Campus Response to the Proposed Revisions to the Executive Order on CSU General Education Breadth Requirement (formerly EO 1100- Revised)**
  
  Our campus response to the proposed revisions referenced above was submitted on November 2. The development of our response was a collaborative effort between the Office of the Provost, the Academic Senate Ethnic Studies Workgroup, the GE Governance Board, the Office of the Registrar and the Office of Academic Programs and Planning.

- **WSCUC Authorization of Distance Education for Winter and Spring 2021**
  
  Our request for authorization of programs currently approved only for on-site instruction to be delivered in the distance education modality due to disruptions from Covid-19 for terms beginning between January 1, 2021 and June 30, 2021 was approved by the WSCUC Commission on October 16, 2020.
Student Affairs  
Report to Academic Senate  
October 20, 2020

- It’s important to keep in mind the need to provide captioned videos for students. Captioning supports diversity; it provides access for students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing and for students with ADHD or learning disabilities as well as visual learners, English Language Learners, and others. Captioning is also required by law. Given the challenge of captioning all recorded materials, the CSU has a webpage which provides guidance on how to prioritize (search under CSU captioning prioritization): https://teachingcommons.cdl.edu/access/docs_multi/docs_mm_caption_prioritization.shtml  CTLT has do it yourself trainings available, ITS can connect faculty with a vendor which provides captioning services (https://accessibility.calpoly.edu/content/instructions/captioning/index), and the DRC is offering monthly trainings for your student staff to learn how to caption (those opportunities will be listed in the Cal Poly report). DRC staff are also available to do a short overview about why captioning is critical, and the resources available. Just reach out to Amy Gode at the DRC to schedule a time for them to visit.

- Campus Health and Wellbeing will be open to students when the university moves to virtual status on Monday November 23. We will remain physically open at the Health Center every business day for the remainder of 2020 to support student’s medical and testing needs. To date, no medical provider or staff that has been working in the Health Center has contracted COVID-19, reinforcing the safety of the facility for serving students when proper public health guidelines are adopted.

- As our student-athletes return to competition under very strict safety guidelines and without spectators, I hope you will find some time to watch their competitions on the Cal Poly Front Row app, available for download in all the places you download those things.

- University Housing will reopen to students at 8am on Sunday, January 3, 2020 unless public health conditions cause a delay in the university’s reopening. All rooms will be single occupancy for Winter Quarter.
From the Board:

- This year, the ASI board of directors will be reviewing an expanded student leader scholarship policy after hearing concerns from the majority of the board last year. The Business and Finance committee recommended a do pass on the proposal. The proposed policy would create scholarships student government-wide, creating a more accessible space for students. All votes on this subject will take place at the November 18th meeting at 5pm.
- The November 4th meeting of the ASI Board of Directors meeting was canceled due to mental wellbeing, health, and safety concerns. All Business items have been moved to the November 18th agenda.

University Union Advisory Board Update:

- The University Union Advisory Board recently voted to endorse two new projects. First, the UUAB endorsed a beautification project for the patio outside the Multicultural Center in the UU. Second, the UUAB endorsed a tribute project to Dolores Huerta, which will be seen on the first floor of the UU. Additionally, the UUAB reviewed the current plans for a student space in building 19. Coming up, the UUAB will review plans for a gender neutral restroom in the UU.

Executive Cabinet:

- The Listen In: A Student Perspective on COVID-19 panel will occur on November 12th from 5-6:30 pm. Tune in to gain a deeper understanding of the various student experiences through this pandemic. The panel will host students from areas across campus, to give a space for faculty and staff to hear first hand experience of navigating Cal Poly during these unprecedented times. The Zoom Webinar ID is 869 9566 0083.

Cal State Student Association (CSSA):

- The CSSA Board of Directors are currently working on creating a policy agenda specific to COVID-19. This will guide how we advocate for students in regards to issues that have arisen due to the pandemic.
Pilot commenced Spring 2015–Spring 2016

- Response rates in pilot:
  - Fall 2015 64%
  - Winter 2016 59%
  - Spring 2016 51%

Procedure for university-wide rollout 2016-2017

- Two one-week evaluation periods
  - Normal: Sunday–Friday of last week of instruction
  - Early: Sunday–Friday of penultimate week of instruction
    - Only Music made use of early evaluations, experiencing dismal response rates
- Students notified by email
  - Prior to evaluation period
  - Daily reminders for evaluations not yet completed
    - One email per class each day until evaluation completed
- Response rates 2016-2017:
  - Fall 2016 66%
  - Winter 2017 61%
  - Spring 2017 55%

Procedural changes for 2017-2018

- Students
  - Portal shows links for class evaluations
  - Email reminders at start of evaluation and Wed, Thur, Fri
- instructors
  - Email about response rates
  - Portal links for their evaluated classes
  - Portal reports response rates
- Response Rates 2017-2018
  - Fall 2017 59%
  - Winter 2018 58%
  - Spring 2018 54%

Procedural changes for 2018-2019

- Faculty
  - No more response rate notification emails
  - Live response rate monitoring through the portlet
  - Access to portlet on the Monday before the evaluation period
Email notification that courses queued for evaluation are visible on the portlet

Faculty encouraged to ensure all courses that meet the evaluation criteria are queued.

- **Response Rates 2018-2019**
  - Fall 2018 55%
  - Winter 2019 57%
  - Spring 2019 51%

**Procedure for 2019-2020**
- Same as 2018-2019
- **Response rates 2019-2020**
  - Fall 2019 52%
  - Winter 2020 53% (completed prior to shift to virtual final exams)
  - Spring 2020 35% (conducted under virtual distance learning due to COVID-19)

**Procedure for 2020-2021**
- Same as 2018-2020
  - Opens evening of Tue 11/17
  - Runs through Tue 11/24
Online Student Evaluation of Instruction

Response Rates

Fall 2019 Response Rates

- CAED: 56.33%
- CAFES: 47.17%
- CENG: 52.21%
- CLA: 51.84%
- CSM: 59.29%
- MISC: 45.55%
- OCOB: 37.33%
- University-wide: 51.74%

Spring 2020 Response Rates

- CAED: 40.24%
- CAFES: 31.53%
- CENG: 39.18%
- CLA: 32.66%
- CSM: 32.86%
- MISC: 23.55%
- OCOB: 32.87%
- University-wide: 34.58%

Winter 2020 Response Rates

- CAED: 50.43%
- CAFES: 49.78%
- CENG: 51.13%
- CLA: 51.83%
- CSM: 59.23%
- MISC: 37.47%
- OCOB: 51.55%
- University-wide: 53.21%
Online Student Evaluation of Instruction
Response Rates

Fall 2019 CAED Response Rates

Fall 2019 CAFES Response Rates

Fall 2019 CENG Response Rates
Online Student Evaluation of Instruction
Response Rates

Fall 2019 CLA Response Rates

- ART: 48.20%
- COMS: 54.06%
- ENG: 48.17%
- ES: 60.57%
- GRC: 58.55%
- HIST: 52.36%
- JRLA: 33.31%
- JOUR: 46.74%
- LAS: 47.19%
- MU: 48.77%
- NUR: 52.24%
- PHIL: 52.44%
- POL: 46.79%
- PSY: 51.86%
- SOC: 51.84%
- THD: 51.86%
- WLC: 51.84%
- CLA Total: 51.84%

Fall 2019 CSM Response Rates

- BIO: 67.83%
- CHEM: 60.87%
- KINE: 55.97%
- LS: 62.60%
- MATH: 52.30%
- PHYS: 56.13%
- SOE: 56.45%
- SSM: 39.22%
- STAT: 62.05%
- CSM Total: 59.29%

Fall 2019 OCOB Response Rates

- BUSA: 47.55%
- BUSF: 50.24%
- BUSM: 52.86%
- BUSMK: 42.47%
- ECON: 44.78%
- GRAD: 43.86%
- IT2: 43.65%
- SBUS: 41.27%
- OCOB Total: 45.98%
Online Student Evaluation of Instruction Response Rates

Winter 2020 CAED Response Rates

- ARCE: 53.46%
- ARCH: 44.76%
- CM: 61.29%
- CRP: 43.08%
- LA: 59.57%
- CAED Total: 50.43%

Winter 2020 CAFES Response Rates

- AG: 28.57%
- AGB: 55.22%
- AGED: 31.78%
- ASG: 57.99%
- BRAE: 60.12%
- EIM: 52.15%
- FSN: 48.49%
- HCS: 44.81%
- MSc2: 6.68%
- NRES: 49.86%
- WHIT: 45.55%
- CAFES Total: 49.78%

Winter 2020 CENG Response Rates

- AERO: 38.2%
- BMED: 51.3%
- CEN: 52.0%
- CSC: 51.9%
- EE: 51.4%
- ENGR: 44.9%
- IME: 50.6%
- MATE: 50.0%
- MECH: 54.7%
- CENG Total: 51.1%
Online Student Evaluation of Instruction Response Rates

Winter 2020 CLA Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>60.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS</td>
<td>52.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>45.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>54.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEC2</td>
<td>59.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>46.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILKA</td>
<td>51.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOUR</td>
<td>44.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>45.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POGS</td>
<td>55.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV2</td>
<td>51.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>36.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THD</td>
<td>57.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGS</td>
<td>57.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLC</td>
<td>51.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winter 2020 CSM Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>64.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>66.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINE</td>
<td>54.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>59.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>54.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>53.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOE</td>
<td>46.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>32.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>65.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winter 2020 OCOB Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUSA</td>
<td>57.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSF</td>
<td>58.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSM</td>
<td>58.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSMK</td>
<td>60.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON</td>
<td>46.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD</td>
<td>50.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT2</td>
<td>40.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBUS</td>
<td>38.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Online Student Evaluation of Instruction
Response Rates

Spring 2020 CLA Response Rates

Response Rate

ART
COMS
ENG
ES
GCJ
HST
JRLA
JOUR
LAIS
MU
PHL
POLJ
PSY2
SOCJ
ThD
WCL
CLA Total

Spring 2020 CSM Response Rates

Response Rate

BIO
CHEM
KINE
LS
MATH
PHYS
SOE
SSM
STAT
CSM Total

Spring 2020 OCOB Response Rates

Response Rate

BUSA
BUSF
BUSM
BUSMK
ECON
GRAD
IT2
SBUS
OCOB Total
University Advising Updates –

Mustang Success Center:

- Successfully transitioned to a first year advising center. College advising centers, with the support of University Advising Retention Specialists will have the primary responsibility of serving second year students and beyond, as well as transfer students.
- Created liaison positions to facilitate communication with the College Advising centers. They meet monthly to collaborate and discuss advising opportunities.
- Continues to provide first and second year advising to Cal Poly Scholars, and advising for student-athletes.

Transfer Center:

- Opened the beginning of winter quarter 2020. Because of the pandemic, the launch of the center transitioned quickly to all online services and support. The Center advocates and provides support for transfers to be successful in and outside the classroom through virtual events such as transfer dialogues, drop-in services, and student academic coaching appointments.
- Collaborated with Admissions, Office of the Registrar, and Academic Programs to review transfer model curriculum and Associate Degree for Transfers.
- The Transfer Center Coordinator established the following:
  - Staff & Faculty Transfer Advisory Board with representation from faculty, academic advising, academic affairs, and student affairs. This advisory board comes together to support large scale transfer initiatives, learn about how to increase transfer support across campus, and share ideas.
  - Transfer Student Advisory Council (TSAC) has representation from all colleges, students who live on and off campus, and ASI. TSAC identifies and communicates needs and strengths within the Transfer Center, provides feedback on new initiatives and transfer student focused proposals put forth by the Transfer Center, and anything else students want to bring attention to or suggest related to the overall Cal Poly transfer student experience.

Retention Team:

- Partnered with the Office of the Registrar to revise the Leave of Absence policy and processes, opening LOA to students on Academic Probation and those dealing with personal issues. Implemented send off and return communication cycle, ensuring eligibility requirements met prior to form submission, providing guidance on procedures related to taking time off and encouraging reengagement.
- Initiated Informal Time Off form providing mechanism for students to notify the University of intention to take up to two terms away and for the Retention Team to reach out immediately with guidance and support, reducing unintended fees incurred, registration mistakes, financial aid loss and providing information to ease students’ return to Cal Poly. Since its inception in April 2020, we have been in direct contact with over 385 students.
- Facilitated data-informed advising services by compiling qualitative and quantitative data related to retention, shedding light on struggles students face and risk-factors that can inform
proactive advising. Shared findings with advising centers, College leadership and advisory
committees, some of whom have since adjusted services toward eliminating Cal Poly’s
graduation gaps.
- Coordinated with Evaluations’ unit to distribute Red DPR reports to advising centers throughout
each term, to allow for proactive outreach related to remaining requirements, change of degree
completion and other necessary form submissions.
- Conducted outreach to almost 6,000 active students not enrolled for subsequent or current
term to provide time-sensitive support and guidance.
- Made updates to the Change of Major portal, easing communication between department
coordinate and students.
Graduation Writing Requirement
Advisory Board Annual Report
Submitted by Dawn Janke
November 4, 2020

Academic Year 19-20
Summary

GWR-designated courses. The advisory board reviewed twelve proposals and approved nine courses and instructors for phase one of the AS-858-18 implementation process: CHEM 354 (all sections), COMS 332 (Kolodziejki and Meserko), ES 322 (Yeh), HIST 322 (Bridger), HIST 326 (Bridger), HIST 350 (Perry), MATE 320 (Harding), WGS 301 (Jacobs), and WLC 370 (Marijuan). Of those courses, CHEM 354, COMS 332, HIST 350, and WGS 301 have thus far been delivered as GWR-designated courses. *Note: these courses have not been formally modified in the Curriculum Management System; all courses that permanently gain the GWR designation will go through the senate’s curriculum approval process as outlined in AS-858-18.

WPE Suspension. In March 2020, in response to COVID-19, the Chancellor’s Office issued a temporary suspension of the GWR, specifically for in-person testing. The WPE was therefore cancelled for spring and summer quarters. The University granted a GWR exemption to spring and summer graduates and continued offering GWR-designated courses to support non-graduating students.

GWR Portfolio Program. In summer 2020, the Writing and Learning Initiatives Office developed a GWR Portfolio Program in consultation with the GWR advisory board. The portfolio program temporarily replaces the WPE for AY 20-21 in response to the March 2020 suspension of GWR in-person testing. Information about the portfolio program is available at https://writingandlearning.calpoly.edu/gwrportfolio.

Academic Year 20-21
Goals and Objectives

GWR-designated courses. The advisory board will consult GWR-designated course instructors to consider any necessary revisions to the professional development program and/or course criteria, as per AS-858-18. In consultation with the advisory board, the Writing and Learning Initiatives Office will partner with the Academic Senate and the Office of the Registrar to finalize the workflow so that newly proposed GWR-designated courses are evaluated through the senate’s curriculum approval process as outlined in AS-858-18 and are appropriately listed in the course catalog.

WPE Suspension. In response to the Chancellor’s Office March 2020 directive to “determine an alternative metric to satisfy the in-person testing requirement via a course or series of courses, beginning with the 2021-22 academic year,” and in accordance with AS-858-18, the advisory board will partner with the senate to establish a timeline to increase GWR-designated courses across the curriculum. The advisory board also will partner with the senate to formalize the GWR Portfolio Program as an alternative pathway to satisfy the testing requirement, which will ensure the University has the capacity to support timely GWR completion for all students. Resources will be central to compliance with the Chancellor’s Office directive; it may be necessary to consider proposing that the $35 WPE fee shift to a $35 portfolio fee, for example.

GWR Program Learning Outcomes. The advisory board will partner with the senate to develop specific, measurable GWR Program Learning Outcomes “to ensure students have the instruction and practice needed in order to achieve university writing outcomes without the use of in-person testing,” as per the March 2020 memorandum. The PLOs will guide GWR Program assessment and ensure pathways to GWR completion (GWR course criteria, GWR Portfolio) align with University learning objectives.

Please direct all GWR-related questions or concerns to Dawn Janke (djanke@calpoly.edu).
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
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
ADOPTED:

ACADEMIC SENATE
Of
THE CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-____-20

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AB1460/EDUCATION CODE 89032 (THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU) ETHNIC STUDIES UNDERGRADUATE GRADUATION REQUIREMENT) IN GENERAL EDUCATION (TITLE V)

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.

**Article 1. Applicability**

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.
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Article 2. Fulfilling CSU General Education Breadth Requirements

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
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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.
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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 supports 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.”
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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.

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.
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## 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><strong>Area A total semester units required:</strong></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><strong>Area B total semester units required:</strong></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><strong>Area C total semester units required:</strong></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><strong>Area D total semester units required:</strong></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><strong>Area E total semester units required:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total GE Units Required** | 39 | 9 | 48

**Note:**
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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.
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 89032c, 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.

---

California’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.²

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? What will happen to departments that currently offer these courses in “Area D”?

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 EMERGENCY MPP APPOINTMENTS

Impact on Existing Policy: Recommends establishing new administrative personnel policies.

WHEREAS: Many faculty, students, alumni, and other campus stakeholders have criticized recent emergency Management Personnel Program (MPP) appointments for, among other things, the lack of transparency and the absence of process; and

WHEREAS: Faculty criticism has addressed the adverse impact that emergency MPP appointments may have upon shared governance; and

WHEREAS, AS-748-12 reaffirms the role of faculty in shared governance at Cal Poly in matters related to “curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and student educational processes;” and

WHEREAS, Administrators in MPP may affect areas of faculty concern, such as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and student educational processes; and

WHEREAS, Standard MPP appointments for positions affecting areas of faculty concern typically involve consultation with faculty; and

WHEREAS, Emergency MPP appointments may involve no faculty consultation; and

WHEREAS, In summer the Academic Senate Executive Committee acts in place of the full Academic Senate (Bylaws VI.B.1); therefore be it

RESOLVED: The administration formalize MPP appointment policies in Campus Administrative Policies (CAP) by Spring 2022 in consultation with the Faculty Affairs Committee,
RESOLVED: All MPP appointments for positions affecting areas of faculty concern involve timely, substantive consultation with the Academic Senate or the Academic Senate Executive Committee when acting on behalf of the Academic Senate, and be it further.

RESOLVED: Emergency MPP appointments should standardly be interim and followed by a full search for a permanent appointment during the academic year.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: Fall, 2020

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
RESOLUTION ON PILOT PATHWAYS PROGRAM WITHIN GENERAL EDUCATION

WHEREAS, The campuswide effort that led to the recent revision of Cal Poly’s General Education (GE) template included an exploration of a pathways program within GE; and

WHEREAS, The Pathway Work Group created by the GE Governance Board released its Report in Spring 2019; and

WHEREAS, Following its review of the Work Group’s Report, the GE Governance Board has compiled guidelines on the structure of a pilot pathways program within GE; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached GEGB Guidelines for a Pilot Pathways Program; and be it further

RESOLVED: Cal Poly use the Guidelines to implement an exploratory pathways program in the 2021–2022 academic year; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the GE Governance Board report to the Academic Senate during the 2023–2024 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.

- GEGB 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.
BACKGROUND

General Education Pathways Work Group Report
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Submitted to General Education Governance Board and Academic Senate
24 May 2019

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 polytechnic 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. 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 GEBG 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.

---

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).
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.

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, GEGB, 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 GEGB 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.
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Appendix B: Sample GE Pathway Proposal Form

Proposal Author

Position

Department

Year Joined Cal Poly

**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>F</td>
<td>F, W, Sp, Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F, W, Sp, Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division Course(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>F, W, Sp, Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>F, W, Sp, Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper- or Lower-Division Course(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F, W, Sp, Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors:</td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F, W, Sp, Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>F, W, Sp, Su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>F, W, Sp, Su</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

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.