Meeting of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, May 17, 2022
3:10 to 5:00 pm
https://calpoly.zoom.us/j/84410533254

I. Minutes: May 3, 2022 Minutes (pp. 2-3)

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office: None
C. Provost: (p. 4)
D. Vice President for Student Affairs: (p. 5)
E. Statewide Senate: (pp. 6-8)
F. CFA: (p. 9)
G. ASI: (p. 10)

IV. Consent Agenda:
A. Agenda items approved by consent – Item A (p. 11)
B. Agenda items approved by consent – Item B (pp. 12-13)

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on UFPP 11.4.2 Departmental Role in the Selection Process for Chairs and Heads: Ken Brown, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 14-25)
B. Resolution on AB 928 and CSU Golden Four: Gary Laver, Academic Senate General Education Governance Board Chair, first reading (pp. 26-28)
C. Resolution to Establish Semester Terms: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 29-37)
D. Resolution to Establish Processes for Curriculum and Academic Program Review for Conversion to Semesters: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 38-49)
E. Resolution on Units of Credit and Time Patterns on Semester Terms: Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 50-75)
F. Resolution on the Creation of a School of Applied Computing: Zachary Peterson, School of Applied Computing Steering Committee, first reading (pp. 76-105)
G. Resolution on Timely Adoption of Courseware in Support of Affordability and Transparency: John Hagen, Academic Senate Instruction Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 106-107)

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:

805-756-1258 - academicsenate.calpoly.edu
Meeting of the Academic Senate  
Tuesday, May 3, 2022

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the minutes from April 12, 2022.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Thomas Gutierrez, Academic Senate Chair, announced that, due to the remainder of the quarter’s heavy business load, the May 24th Executive Committee meeting will become a Senate meeting. Additionally, there is a possible meeting scheduled for Thursday, June 2nd. Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee Chair, will be reaching out to the Caucuses to clarify Semester Conversion Resolutions.

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: Thomas Gutierrez, Academic Senate Chair, encourages senators to reach out to constituents to inform them about resolutions.

   All other reports were submitted as written reports and can be found here: https://content-calpoly.edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa050322.pdf

IV. Special Reports:
   A. President’s Report: Jeff Armstrong, President, gave a COVID-19 update, reported that there has been a small increase in positive tests, and that there is a 2:1 ratio of symptomatic cases to asymptomatic cases. He also shared that there is research being done that measures the antibody levels in unvaccinated students; individual data will not be reported. President Armstrong also reported that Jolene Koester, former CSUN President, will take on the role of Interim Chancellor for at least the next year. He thanked the WSCUC team and Academic Senate for participation in accreditation visits and preparation. Additionally, President Armstrong reported that, based on preliminary data, the incoming class of 2026 will be the most diverse cohort entering Cal Poly. Cal Poly will be opening a new Latinx Center in the fall quarter. He also acknowledged the implementation of the College-Based Fee, discussed the staff salary survey, mentioned an upcoming faculty salary survey, shared the updated June Commencement schedule, and communicated that summer school will be switching to state side. He gave a brief state/CSU budget update that looks optimistic and outlined several student competitions and awards in academics and athletics. He discussed future dorm upgrades and faculty/staff campus housing. He mentioned ongoing searches for VPs in R-EDGE and OUDI. He mentioned ongoing planning surrounding Diablo Canyon and Swanton Ranch.

V. Consent Agenda:
   A. Department Modification Approval for the B.A. Political Science program with a 3+3 Pre-Law Option
   B. Campus Specific Degree Title Change to plant Sciences

   All items have been approved for consent and can be found here: https://content-calpoly.edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa050322.pdf

VI. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on New Degree Program for Master of Science in Statistics: Andrew Schaffner, Statistics Department Chair, introduced in first reading a Resolution on New Degree Program for a Master of Science in Statistics. This would be a two-year program but would also be available as a blended program with curriculum
consisting of three course categories. M/S/P to move resolution to second reading. M/S/P to adopt Resolution on New Degree Program for Master of Science in Statistics.

B. **Resolution on AB 928 and Common GE Pathway:** Gary Laver, Academic Senate General Education Governance Board Chair, introduced in first reading a Resolution on AB 928 and Common GE Pathway. AB 9 28 requires a common GE transfer pathway between the UCs, CSU, and community colleges. The resolution makes recommendations on implementing this common pathway. The pathway draft will be released in May 2023. M/S/P to move resolution to second reading. M/S/P to pass Resolution on AB 928 and Common GE Pathway.

C. **Resolution on Scheduling of Online Assessments:** John Hagen, Academic Senate Instruction Committee Chair, introduced in first reading a Resolution on the Scheduling of Online Assessments. The text of the resolution remains unchanged; however, the text in the attachment for guidelines has changed. The resolution clarifies that it would be fine to have daily assignments for classes that meet on successive days. M/S/P to move resolution to second reading. M/S/P to pass Resolution on Scheduling of Online Assessments.

D. **Resolution to Establish Semester Terms:** Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee Chair, introduced in first reading a Resolution to Establish Semester Terms. This is the first of three resolutions that will be brought to the Senate. This resolution designates two 16-week terms (15 for instruction and 1 for finals) as well as a retention of a summer term. The resolution also calls for an establishment of a winter intersession period and a creation of two 7.5-week modules in both the fall and spring semesters. This resolution will return in first reading at the next Academic Senate meeting.

E. **Resolution on AB 928 and CSU Golden Four:** Gary Laver, Academic Senate General Education Governance Board Chair, introduced in first reading a Resolution on AB 928 and CSU Golden Four. AB 9 28 requires a common GE transfer pathway between the UCs, CSU, and community colleges. The resolution reaffirms campus commitment to the importance of GE areas and their retention. This resolution will return in first reading at the next Academic Senate Meeting.

VII. **Discussion Item(s):** None

VIII. **Adjournment:** This meeting was adjourned at 4:34.

Minutes submitted by

[Signature]

Shefali Mistry
**CSU Student Research Competition**

Four Cal Poly students received awards at the 36th Annual CSU Student Research Competition, which was held April 29-30. Students competed by discipline category and, where feasible, by division (undergraduate/graduate). With four awards, Cal Poly was tied for the most awards received by any campus at this year’s competition.

The awarded students are listed below with their major/program, research project title and, and the name of their faculty advisor.

First Place in Health, Nutrition and Clinical Sciences – Undergraduate Category, Tanvi Gehani (Biomedical Engineering), Effect of Coconut Oil Intake in a Pig Model of Pediatric Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease
Advisor: Magdalena Maj (Biological Sciences Department)

Second Place in Education – Graduate Category, Jacob Campbell (Higher Education Counseling in Student Affairs Graduate Program), Defining Mixed-Race College Students: Examining Graduation Gaps Between Multiracial & Monoracial Undergraduates
Advisor: Sonia Ramrakhiani (School of Education)

Second Place in Behavioral, Social Sciences and Public Administration – Graduate Category, Isaac Ho (Food Science Blended Master’s Program), Use of Preference Analysis to Identify Early Adopter Mind-Sets of Insect-based Food Products
Advisor: Amy Lammert (Food Science and Nutrition Department)

Second Place in Biological and Agricultural Sciences – Graduate Category, Savannah Weaver (Biological Sciences Graduate Program), Additive Effects of Humidity and Temperature on Acclimation in a Lizard
Advisor: Emily Taylor (Biological Sciences Department)

**CSU Grad Slam Three-Minute Thesis Competition**

Jacob Campbell, a graduate student in the higher education counseling/student affairs (HECSA) program and retention specialist in University Advising, won second place in the CSU Grad Slam Three-Minute Thesis Competition on May 6. Campbell presented on his thesis, which examines how federal race/ethnicity reporting standards recategorize some self-reported multiracial students and how this translation impacts the visibility of graduation equity gaps. Campbell and Savannah Weaver, a biological science graduate student, competed in the second annual competition in which they presented their thesis research in three minutes or less while only using one static PowerPoint slide. Campbell and Weaver competed with 35 master’s and doctoral students from 20 other CSU campuses. This was the first year Cal Poly students have participated in the competition.
Student Affairs Report to Academic Senate
May 17, 2022
Prepared May 12, 2022

Commencement Updates

Faculty are encouraged to participate in full regalia in our commencement ceremonies in the stadium on June 11-12 to celebrate our graduates. Additionally, 180 volunteers are being recruited to support commencement along with hundreds of student employees and staff partners who participate in the events as a function of their role.

Each of these groups, including faculty participants, will have access to a unique module in the Canvas learning management system which describes their participation in commencement including detailed schedules, diagrams, and expectations. The canvas course will be available in late May.

Staffing updates

Michelle Crawford has been appointed the next Executive Director of Associated Students, Inc. Michelle has been serving as the Interim Executive Director for the past year.

Awards Season

It’s awards time at Cal Poly. Yesterday was our LEAD awards, recognizing student leaders from many different organizations. Thursday is both the President’s Diversity Awards (11am-12:30pm in the Performing Arts Center Courtyard) and the Community Service Awards (Student Services Building -124 – Courtyard – from 4-5:30pm).

Support for Students

Counseling Services offers a number of “end of quarter” workshops to help students navigate the issues that come up at the end of the year. These include workshops on maximizing time and stress survival. You can learn more and refer students online at: https://chw.calpoly.edu/counseling/end-quarter-survival-kit-workshops
Attached is the first draft of the common GE transfer pathway created in response to AB 928. Area A1 survived, but Area E and the Lower-Division C elective were cut.

Please see next page
March 7, 2022

TO: ICAS

FROM: Robert Horwitz
Chair of Special Committee on AB 928

SUBJECT: Recommendation on a singular GE transfer pathway

The Special Committee on AB 928 met three times to discuss the singular general education (GE) transfer pathway. After considering several options and patterns, the group came to consensus on a pattern that it believes satisfies the legislation's requirements for both a clear and transparent singular pathway, and maintaining at 34 the total units required to complete the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC). The recommendation is best understood by the attached chart.

For purposes of quick summary, the new pathway pattern recommended to ICAS requires the following:

- UC will accept Oral Communication as a new (third) course in Area 1 – English Communication.
- The CCC will revise and strengthen courses fulfilling the Oral Communication subject requirement to meet new core competencies.
- The number of courses required in Area 3 – Arts and Humanities will decrease from three to two (one in Arts, one in Humanities).
- UC will remove its Language Other than English proficiency requirement from IGETC and treat it as a graduation requirement.
- CSU will remove its Lifelong Learning and Self-Development course from IGETC and treat it as an upper-division requirement.

Note that the pattern includes a forthcoming new Area 7 – Ethnic Studies requirement. The UC Academic Senate recently approved this requirement, proposing to accommodate it within IGETC by reducing from three to two courses required in Area 4 – Social and Behavioral Sciences. It is anticipated that a final vote to approve Area 7 – Ethnic Studies for the CSU will occur at the March 2022 CSU Board of Trustees meeting.

These recommendations come with full support of the Special Committee members, following careful deliberation as well as a commitment to strong GE preparation for successful CCC student transfer to UC and CSU.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IGETC Area</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Proposed GE Pattern</th>
<th>UC 7-course pattern</th>
<th>CSU GE-Breadth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>1 course (3 units)</td>
<td>2 English courses Area A – 3 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Critical Thinking &amp; Composition</td>
<td>1 course (3 units)</td>
<td>1B = writing intensive English Language Communication &amp; Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1C*</td>
<td>Oral Communication (*currently CSU only)</td>
<td>1 course (3 units)</td>
<td>Golden 4 (Oral Communication, Written Communication, Critical Thinking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Mathematical Concepts &amp; Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>1 course (3 units)</td>
<td>1 mathematical concepts course Golden 4 (Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Arts (1 course required)</td>
<td>2 courses (6 units)</td>
<td>4 additional UC-transferable courses chosen from at least 2 of the following subject areas: Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Humanities (1 course required)</td>
<td>2 courses (6 units)</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>2 courses (6 units)</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>1 course (3 units)</td>
<td>Physical &amp; Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>1 course (3 units)</td>
<td>Physical &amp; Biological Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5C</td>
<td>Laboratory (for Bio/Phys Sci course)</td>
<td>(1 unit)</td>
<td>Scientific Inquiry &amp; Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Lifelong Learning &amp; Self-Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area E – 1 course Lifelong Learning &amp; Self-Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6A**</td>
<td>Language Other Than English (LOTE) (**currently UC only, carries no units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Area F – 1 course Ethnic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>1 course (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 courses 34 units</td>
<td>7 courses 13 courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University has paid this year's General Salary Increase for faculty. Faculty should have received a lump sum payment for this year's 4% GSI, retroactive to July 1, 2021. The ongoing 4% GSI should have been reflected in the May 1, 2022 paychecks / direct deposits, and should be reflected in future paychecks / direct deposits.

The University has also paid the one-time bonus for faculty. The bonus was paid to faculty who were on active pay status when our new CBA was ratified (February 3, 2022). The amount of each faculty member's bonus was based on their timebase during the 2020-21 academic year. Faculty who were full time during the 2020-21 AY should have received $3500; for faculty who worked part time last year, the bonus was prorated by their 2020-21 timebase. The bonus is considered taxable income and is subject to tax withholding.

The University has paid Service Salary Increases for some eligible faculty. The University expects to finish processing SSIs for all eligible faculty by the end of May. Faculty who are eligible for the Service Salary Increase have received or will receive a lump sum payment for the 2.65% SSI, retroactive to the faculty member's anniversary date (date of hire). The ongoing 2.65% SSI will then be reflected in future paychecks / direct deposits.

Faculty can see their new salaries by checking their compensation history at My Cal Poly Portal > Personal Info > My Job Info > View Compensation History.

Any faculty members who have questions about their raises should contact Academic Personnel.
- The ASI Board of Directors recommended the FY 2022-2023 ASI Budget to President Armstrong for approval at the last meeting.
- The ASI election results for ASI President and the ASI Board of Directors were verified and approved at the last meeting.
- The ASI Board of Directors approved to appoint Michelle Crawford as the new Executive Director (current Interim Executive Director)
  - The ASI Executive Director search committee conducted a nation search with the help of a search firm and recommended three final candidates. These candidates visited campus and went through second round interviews. Out of the three candidates, Michelle Crawford was unanimously recommended by the committee to the board of directors.
- The VP of OUDI (Office of Diversity & Inclusion) is currently conducting semifinalist interviews and will meet with President Armstrong to recommend which candidates should move forward for campus visits.
CATALOG/COURSE REVIEW: Following the practice implemented in previous years, summaries of all course or catalog proposals sent by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to the Senate for consideration are posted on the web. Every senator is expected to review these proposals as well as the accompanying recommendations of the Curriculum Committee. The URL for the proposals appearing on the March 17, 2022 consent agenda is provided here:

These items are found in the [Status of Proposals](#), Proposals Outside of the Catalog Review Cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Issues, concerns, and questions regarding this curriculum proposal should be directed to Greg Bohr, chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee. If the concern is strong enough, any senator may request an item be removed from the Consent Agenda by March 10, 2022.

Pursuant to the curriculum appeals process adopted by the Academic Senate on May 4, 2010, "Items removed from the Consent Agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as discussion items. The Senate Chair (or designee) will invite representatives from the concerned departments and the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed. Following discussion in the Senate, the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee will make the final decision to approve, disapprove, or return the items to committee (at any level) for further development. Items not removed from the Consent Agenda are considered approved on the meeting date of the Consent Agenda."
2022-25 CATALOG REVIEW: Following the practice implemented in previous years, summaries of all course or catalog proposals sent by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee to the Senate for consideration are posted on the web. Every senator is expected to review these proposals as well as the accompanying recommendations of the Curriculum Committee.

2022-25 catalog proposals submitted by the following departments/programs and identified in their respective college summary in the Curriculum Handbook:

**College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences**
- Animal Science Department
- Agribusiness Department
- College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences

**College of Engineering**
- Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering Department
- Materials Engineering Department

**College of Liberal Arts**
- Art & Design Department
- Journalism Department

**College of Science and Mathematics**
- Chemistry & Biochemistry Department
- College of Science and Mathematics
- Kinesiology and Public Health Department
- Physics Department

**Orfalea College of Business**
- Economics Area

To view a college summary, go to the online [Curriculum Handbook](#). Click on Status of Proposals, scroll to 2022-25 Catalog Proposals - College Summaries' section, select the link for the appropriate college.

To view the proposal for a course or program, go to My Cal Poly Portal - Academics tab - Curriculum Management portlet. Select the Course Inventory Management link to search for a course; select the Program Management link to search for a program.

Issues, concerns, and questions regarding a curriculum proposal should be directed to Greg Bohr, chair of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee. If the concern is strong enough, any senator may request an item to be removed from the Consent Agenda by May 10, 2022.

Pursuant to the curriculum appeals process adopted by the Academic Senate on May 4, 2010, "Items removed from the Consent Agenda will be placed on the Senate agenda as discussion items. The Senate Chair (or designee) will invite representatives from the concerned departments and the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee to be present at the meetings where pulled proposals will be discussed. Following discussion in the Senate, the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee will make the final decision to approve, disapprove, or return the items to
committee (at any level) for further development. Items not removed from the Consent Agenda are considered approved on the meeting date of the Consent Agenda."
LENGTH ON UFPP 11.4.2 DEPARTMENTAL ROLE IN THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR
CHAIRS AND HEADS

Impact on Existing Policy: Policy enacted by this resolution includes expressions of already established policy based on AM-20171030 in UFPP Appendix. Policy in 11.4.1 was established in AS-934-22 and the editorial revisions attached here supersede that language for UFPP 2022-23.1

WHEREAS, Departmental voting procedures for recommendations to deans for internal department chairs and heads are limited by policy established in AM-20171030: Settlement on Lecturer Voting; and

WHEREAS, These policies on voting procedures are expressed in “Cal Poly Election Process for Internal Department Heads/Chairs” available on the Academic Personnel website; and

WHEREAS, The scope of the ways departments work with deans in the selection of departmental leadership should be clear to faculty and administration; and

WHEREAS, The nature of acting and interim chair and head appointments should be clear to faculty and administration; and

WHEREAS, University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) is the governing document for faculty personnel policies at Cal Poly with its appendix containing administrative memos, therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy contained in UFPP 11.4.2 Departmental Role in the Selection Process for Chairs and Heads be placed in UFPP Academic Year 2022-23, along with other revisions in 11.4.1, and be it further

RESOLVED: “Cal Poly Election Process for Internal Department Heads/Chairs” be placed in UFPP Appendix, and be it further
RESOLVED: By Fall 2022 colleges and the library revise chapter 11 of their personnel policy documents as needed to conform with 11.4.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: March 29, 2022

(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.
11.4. Department Governance

11.4.1. Department Leadership

11.4.1.1. Policy in 11.4.1 established by AS-934-22.
11.4.1.2. Department chairs and heads are faculty who have administrative functions as part of their assignment. Department chairs and heads serve at the pleasure of the dean. Appointment of chairs and heads are made by the dean after consultation with the faculty, the provost, and the president. Consultation with the faculty includes the departmental selection processes contained in 11.4.2.
11.4.1.3. In exceptional cases MPP administrators may be appointed as chairs or heads on an acting or interim basis. Also, department chairs and heads may be appointed to MPP positions on an interim basis. Acting and interim chair and head appointments are covered further in 11.4.2.
11.4.1.4. Department chairs receive three-year renewable appointments. The definite term of chair appointments allows for a rotation of department leadership providing new leadership, fresh ideas, shorter term action plans, and the opportunity for more faculty to rotate through this leadership role.
11.4.1.5. Department heads receive appointments over an indefinite period, providing long-term continuity of leadership within their department and college.
11.4.1.6. Deans determine whether a department chair or department head appointment best suits the needs of the department and college.
11.4.1.7. Department chairs and heads may have academic year appointments, 12-month appointments. The nature of the appointment depends on the nature of their duties in the academic year and during summer, as determined by the dean, and are compensated accordingly.
11.4.1.8. The responsibilities and priorities of department chairs and heads will vary across colleges, departments, and individuals. Departments have varying models of how the responsibilities listed below will be accomplished. Although there are many items listed as among responsibilities of the department chairs’ and heads’ responsibilities, some of these items may be delegated to other faculty and staff depending on the size of the department, organizational structure, support staff and the fraction of the assignment of department chair’s or head’s assignment that is dedicated to administrative duties. The college deans will help the department chairs and heads understand the prioritization of these duties in conjunction with the college and department’s vision and goals.
11.4.1.9. Academic Personnel maintains a document describing in detail the responsibilities and priorities of department chairs and heads, including the following areas of management and leadership for the department:
11.4.1.10. Department chairs and heads are subject to annual administrative review. This administrative review is wholly distinct from faculty evaluations that are covered in UFPP 4-6. The administrative review of department chairs and heads is conducted by the dean.

11.4.2. Departmental Role in the Selection Process for Chairs and Heads

11.4.2.1. Policy in 11.4.2 established by [cite Senate action] and AM-20171030, editorially revised in [AM-20180208].

11.4.2.2. Processes conducted within a department for selection of candidates for department chairs and heads are advisory, providing recommendations from the department faculty to the dean, and shall be specified in department or college faculty personnel policy documents. Departments may recommend to the dean one or more candidates for chair or head.

11.4.2.3. Any departmental practice for selecting candidates for department chairs or heads that involves voting among the department faculty shall incorporating the voting requirements outlined below. These voting requirements represent a minimum; departments may modify their department chair or head selection recommendation policies through the joint governance process approved by the dean.

11.4.2.3.1. All 12.12 (3-year) lecturers, including counselors and librarians, with an appointment in the academic quarter term of the vote will be eligible to participate in the vote to recommend a department chair or head, with a full vote in their department voting process. Nothing in the balloting process will differentiate the three-year lecturers’ vote from tenured and tenure-track faculty votes for department chair or head recommendations.

11.4.2.3.2. All other lecturers will be granted an advisory vote. These advisory votes will be differentiated and summarized separately from the votes of the 12.12 (3-year) lecturers, tenured faculty, and tenure-track faculty.

11.4.2.3.3. Lecturers shall be notified regarding the department voting process in the same manner as all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

11.4.2.3.4. Lecturers eligible to cast a vote or an advisory vote shall be afforded the same opportunity as tenured and tenure-track faculty to attend regularly scheduled
department meetings when department chair or head
recommendation balloting is scheduled.
11.4.2.4. The results of all departmental voting shall be included
in the department’s basis for recommendations of suitable
candidates from the department to the dean.
11.4.2.5. An acting chair or head may be appointed from faculty
within the department, from faculty not in the affected department,
or from administrators. Acting chairs and heads are intended to
serve for short periods when the current chair or head is unable to
serve (e.g. while on sabbatical or leave). Standardly, acting chair
appointments are for periods shorter than one year when the
current chair is expected to return. Since appointments of acting
chairs and heads can be time sensitive and may occur on occasions
when it is not feasible to consult with the affected department
ahead of the appointment, deans may use their discretion about
whether or not to consult with department faculty in appointment
of an acting chair or head.
11.4.2.6. An interim chair or head may be appointed
from faculty within the department, from faculty not in the affected
department, or from administrators. Interim chairs and heads are
intended to serve until the dean makes a standard appointment of a
department chair or head (as covered in 11.4.1). The initial
appointment of an interim chair or head shall be for a defined
period of time—no longer than one year—and renewed as needed.
Since initial appointments of interim chairs and heads can be time
sensitive and may occur on occasions when it is not feasible to
consult with the affected department ahead of the appointment,
deans may use their discretion about whether or not to consult with
department faculty in the initial appointment of an interim chair or
head. When an extension of an interim appointment is necessary,
the dean shall solicit feedback from all department faculty, including
all lecturers with an appointment in the academic term when the
feedback is collected, for use in the dean’s decision about the
interim chair or head reappointment. For renewal of interim
appointments extending beyond the academic year following the
appointment, the dean shall solicit feedback from all department
faculty, including all lecturers employed when the feedback is
collected, for use in the dean’s decision about the chair or head
appointment.
11.4.2.7. In exceptional cases the college may undergo a
standard faculty recruitment to hire a department chair or head. In
addition to all the normal aspects of a faculty recruitment, the chair
of the search committee shall solicit feedback from all lecturers with
an appointment in the academic term employed during the quarter
of the search; these lecturers will be granted a full advisory vote,
which will be presented to the faculty search committee. This
advisory vote shall be included in the basis for recommendations of
suitable candidates from the search committee to the dean. The
result of a successful search for a new faculty member to serve as chair or head shall be a standard chair or head appointment as covered in 11.4.1.

11.4.3. Changes in Department Leadership Models

11.4.3.1. Policy in 11.4.3 established by AS-935-22, superseding AS-801-15.

11.4.3.2. The dean has discretion over the type of department chair or head appointments appropriate for the college and department.

11.4.3.3. Changes in department leadership models shall involve a consultative process with department faculty and staff.

11.4.3.4. Colleges shall specify in their personnel policy documents the process for implementing such a change in departmental leadership.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) proposes placing into UFPP policies on the departmental role in the selection of chairs or heads, including existing policy on requirements for lecturer participation in any departmental voting procedures for such recommendations as well as policies pertaining to appointment of acting and interim chairs and heads.

BACKGROUND: The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for approval of updates to University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) including consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and clear identification of which policy documents have been superseded by a proposed change. This process uses Academic Senate resolutions to establish new policy, revise existing policy, or substantially reformulate existing policy.

Summary

Administrative memos establishing university personnel policies reside in the UFPP Appendix, updated annually and available on the Academic Personnel website. In Fall 2017 a no-fault settlement to a grievance established university level policy on departmental voting procedures concerning the advising of deans in the appointments of internally selected chairs and heads. This policy required such elections to include 12.12 (3-year) faculty along with tenure-line faculty equivalently in such elections, and required other lecturers to have a separate advisory vote. An email to the faculty on this matter is in UFPP Appendix as AM-20171030: Settlement on Lecturer Voting. The document “Cal Poly Election Process for Internal Department Heads/Chairs” from February 8, 2018 expresses these requirements in policy form, and therefore should be placed in the UFPP Administrative Memos appendix as AM-20180208.

FAC proposes placing these existing policies into UFPP 11.4.2, along with other related policies concerning the departmental role in the selection of department chairs and heads. These other policies cover acting and interim chair and head appointments, external searches for chairs and heads, and the role of faculty, including lecturers, in these procedures.

Impact on Existing Policy

The policies concerning voting procedures contained in UFPP 11.4.2 expresses current policy and practice at Cal Poly. The impact on existing policy by placing these policies in UFPP amounts to formalizing existing practice and standardizing vocabulary about department leadership. College and library personnel policies must conform with the policies in 11.4.2 concerning acting and interim chair and head appointments.
### Implementation
College and department personnel policies concerning voting procedures for recommendations to the dean of internal chair/head candidates, as well as the other policies about departmental roles in selections of chairs and heads and the nature of acting and interim appointments need to be updated to cite UFPP 11.4.2.

### Consultation with Faculty Units
Consultation on this matter is concurrent with its placement on the Academic Senate Executive Committee and main meeting agendas. Deans have provided feedback from their colleges and their own feedback on the formulation of these policies.

What follows is the proposed text of 11.4.2 contained within the entirety of subchapter 11.4, and the administrative documents to be placed in UFPP Appendix.

The policies in 11.4.1 and 11.4.3 were recently passed by the Senate and endorsed by Pres. Armstrong. The proposed policies for 11.4.2 are best seen in the context of the whole of 11.4, and so we provide the entirety of that subchapter here. Policy in 11.4.1. includes cross references to 11.4.2 and some editorial revisions.
11.4. Department Governance
11.4.1. Department Leadership
11.4.1.1. Policy in 11.4.1 established by AS-934-22.
11.4.1.2. Department chairs and heads are faculty who have administrative functions as part of their assignment. Department chairs and heads serve at the pleasure of the dean. Appointment of chairs and heads are made by the dean after consultation with the faculty, the provost, and the president. Consultation with the faculty includes the departmental selection processes contained in 11.4.2.
11.4.1.3. In exceptional cases MPP administrators may be appointed as chairs or heads on an acting or interim basis. Also, department chairs and heads may be appointed to MPP positions on an interim basis. Acting and interim chair and head appointments are covered further in 11.4.2.
11.4.1.4. Department chairs receive three-year renewable appointments. The definite term of chair appointments allows for a rotation of department leadership providing new leadership, fresh ideas, shorter term action plans, and the opportunity for more faculty to rotate through this leadership role.
11.4.1.5. Department heads receive appointments over an indefinite period, providing long-term continuity of leadership within their department and college.
11.4.1.6. Deans determine whether a department chair or department head appointment best suits the needs of the department and college.
11.4.1.7. Department chairs and heads may have academic year appointments, 12-month appointments. The nature of the appointment depends on the nature of their duties in the academic year and during summer, as determined by the dean, and are compensated accordingly.
11.4.1.8. The responsibilities and priorities of department chairs and heads will vary across colleges, departments, and individuals. Departments have varying models of how the responsibilities listed below will be accomplished. Although there are many items listed among responsibilities of department chairs and heads, some of these items may be delegated to other faculty and staff depending on the size of the department, organizational structure, support staff and the fraction of the assignment of department chairs or heads that is dedicated to administrative duties. The college deans will help the department chairs and heads understand the prioritization of these duties in conjunction with the college and department’s vision and goals.
11.4.1.9. Academic Personnel maintains a document describing in detail the responsibilities and priorities of department chairs and heads, including the following areas of management and leadership for the department:
   • Administration of department affairs
- Budget development and administration
- Department personnel
- Academic programs and curriculum
- Student engagement and success
- Advocacy for the department’s interests
- Community engagement and development activities

11.4.1.10. Department chairs and heads are subject to annual administrative review. This administrative review is wholly distinct from faculty evaluations that are covered in UFPP 4-6. The administrative review of department chairs and heads is conducted by the dean.

11.4.2. Departmental Role in the Selection Process for Chairs and Heads

11.4.2.1. Policy in 11.4.2 established by [cite Senate action] and AM-20171030, editorially revised in [AM-20180208].

11.4.2.2. Processes conducted within a department for selection of candidates for department chairs and heads are advisory, providing recommendations from the department faculty to the dean, and shall be specified in department or college faculty personnel policy documents. Departments may recommend to the dean one or more candidates for chair or head.

11.4.2.3. The departmental practice for selecting candidates for department chairs or heads shall involve voting among the department faculty incorporating the voting requirements outlined below. These voting requirements represent a minimum; departments may modify their department chair or head recommendation policies through the joint governance process approved by the dean.

11.4.2.3.1. All 12.12 (3-year) lecturers, including counselors and librarians, with an appointment in the academic term of the vote will be eligible to participate in the vote to recommend a department chair or head, with a full vote in their department voting process. Nothing in the balloting process will differentiate the three-year lecturers’ vote from tenured and tenure-track faculty votes for department chair or head recommendations.

11.4.2.3.2. All other lecturers will be granted an advisory vote. These advisory votes will be differentiated and summarized separately from the votes of the 12.12 (3-year) lecturers, tenured faculty, and tenure-track faculty.

11.4.2.3.3. Lecturers shall be notified regarding the department voting process in the same manner as all tenured and tenure-track faculty.

11.4.2.3.4. Lecturers eligible to cast a vote or an advisory vote shall be afforded the same opportunity as tenured and tenure-track faculty to attend regularly scheduled department meetings when department chair or head recommendation balloting is scheduled.
11.4.2.4. The results of all departmental voting shall be included in the department’s basis for recommendations of suitable candidates from the department to the dean.

11.4.2.5. An acting chair or head may be appointed from faculty within the department, from faculty not in the affected department, or from administrators. Acting chairs and heads are intended to serve for short periods when the current chair or head is unable to serve (e.g. while on sabbatical or leave). Standardly, acting chair appointments are for periods shorter than one year when the current chair is expected to return. Since appointments of acting chairs and heads can be time sensitive and may occur on occasions when it is not feasible to consult with the affected department ahead of the appointment, deans may use their discretion about whether or not to consult with department faculty in appointment of an acting chair or head.

11.4.2.6. An interim chair or head may be appointed from faculty within the department, from faculty not in the affected department, or from administrators. Interim chairs and heads are intended to serve until the dean makes a standard appointment of a department chair or head (as covered in 11.4.1). The initial appointment of an interim chair or head shall be for a defined period no longer than one year, and renewed as needed. Since initial appointments of interim chairs and heads can be time sensitive and may occur on occasions when it is not feasible to consult with the affected department ahead of the appointment, deans may use their discretion about whether or not to consult with department faculty in the initial appointment of an interim chair or head. When an extension of an interim appointment is necessary, the dean shall solicit feedback from all department faculty, including all lecturers with an appointment in the academic term when the feedback is collected, for use in the dean’s decision about the interim chair or head reappointment.

11.4.2.7. In exceptional cases the college may undergo a standard faculty recruitment to hire a department chair or head. In addition to all the normal aspects of a faculty recruitment, the chair of the search committee shall solicit feedback from all lecturers with an appointment in the academic term of the search; these lecturers will be granted a full advisory vote, which will be presented to the faculty search committee. This advisory vote shall be included in the basis for recommendations of suitable candidates from the search committee to the dean. The result of a successful search for a new faculty member to serve as chair or head shall be a standard chair or head appointment as covered in 11.4.1.

11.4.3. Changes in Department Leadership Models

11.4.3.1. Policy in 11.4.3 established by AS-935-22, superseding AS-801-15.
11.4.3.2. The dean has discretion over the type of department chair or head appointments appropriate for the college and department.
11.4.3.3. Changes in department leadership models shall involve a consultative process with department faculty and staff.
11.4.3.4. Colleges shall specify in their personnel policy documents the process for implementing such a change in departmental leadership.
WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 928 (AB 928), the “Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021: Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee,” was signed into legislation in October 2021; and

WHEREAS, AB 928 requires a common lower-division General Education (GE) transfer pathway that will meet transfer requirements into both the California State University (CSU) and University of California (UC) systems; and

WHEREAS, AB 928 requires the establishment of the “Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates” (ICAS) to develop the common GE pathway for transfer students by May 31, 2023; and

WHEREAS, For the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), the UC system seems to require 11 lower-division courses while the CSU requires 12 lower-division courses; and

WHEREAS, The CSU has announced that, following the completion of the common GE pathway for transfer students, systemwide GE policy will be changed to conform with the common GE pathway by summer 2024; and

WHEREAS, It is likely the ICAS will recommend an 11-course lower-division GE transfer pathway; and

WHEREAS, The current CSU GE policy requires that all students successfully complete the “Golden Four” (A1: Oral Communication, A2: Written Communication, A3: Critical Thinking, and B4: Quantitative Reasoning); and

Impact on Existing Policy: None
WHEREAS, It is the impression of many CSU faculty and Academic Senates that the Chancellor’s Office, based on the ICAS template, will consolidate some of the learning outcomes of the Golden Four; and

WHEREAS, In particular, CSU Oral Communication (Area A1) is suspected to be absorbed by some of the other courses in the Golden Four because the UC does not require a course in oral communication; and

WHEREAS, Other possible courses to be dropped from CSU GE are Area E: Lifelong Learning and Self-Development, which is outside of the Golden Four, and Area A3: Critical Thinking (even though critical thinking is part of the UC IGETC pathway) (UC transfer IGETC advice); and

WHEREAS, Courses in these areas are important to student learning because they provide students with employable skills, teach them how to advocate for social justice, function as an equalizer for students from all backgrounds and experiences, and help to prepare students to respond to misinformation; and

WHEREAS, Both oral communication and critical thinking are core competencies for WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC), the CSU and UC accrediting agency (WSCUC Core Competencies); and

WHEREAS, The remaining two courses in the Golden Four are already full of content in order to satisfy their learning objectives and cannot absorb the A1: Oral Communication or the A3: Critical Thinking learning objectives in an educationally effective manner; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate notes that it is misleading to say that the UC requires 11 lower-division courses for IGETC because very few UC campuses actually require 11 lower-division courses for transfers; and

WHEREAS, Complying with AB 928 by dropping one or two courses from the CSU IGETC list will not and can not secure a common transfer pathway for transfer students as long as IGETC decisions can be made not just at a UC campus level, but at a UC college level, let alone consideration of the UC “Basic Requirements”; therefore be it

RESOLVED, The disciplines in the CSU Golden Four represent essential, foundational learning not only for the GE curriculum, but for every major curriculum as well; and be it

RESOLVED, That in light of the decades-long educational value the CSU has many times confirmed, courses in oral communication, lifelong learning, and
critical thinking should be upheld, and the Golden Four disciplines should be retained as distinct areas within CSU GE and IGETC; and be it

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the Office of the Chancellor, all CSU Academic Senate Chairs, and the Academic Senate Statewide Executive Committee.

Proposed by: General Education Governance Board
Date: March 18, 2022

---

(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
WHEREAS, the California State University Chancellor’s Office has directed Cal Poly to convert from quarters to semesters beginning in fall 2026; and,

WHEREAS, a rationale given by the Chancellor’s Office for converting from quarters to semesters is to align Cal Poly’s academic calendar with the other campuses in the Cal State University System; and,

WHEREAS, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) states that “[t]he work year of an academic year employee shall not exceed one hundred eighty (180) workdays or days in lieu thereof. This provision shall not preclude the establishment of an academic year calendar equaling less than one hundred eighty (180) days. The campus academic calendar shall establish workdays of academic year employees” (20.4); and,

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s Campus Administrative Policies (CAP) states that “[t]he typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days. From year-to-year a variation of plus or minus two days is permissible. There shall be a minimum of 170 academic workdays in the academic year. There shall be a maximum of 180 academic workdays in the academic year” (CAP 211.1); and

WHEREAS, 13 of the 23 California State University campuses offer a winter and/or May intersession period for student to maintain progress to degree; therefore be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate approve the attached “Establishment of Semester Terms.”

Proposed by: Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee
Date: April 19, 2022
Academic Senate Ad Hoc Quarter to Semester Committee
Establishment of Semester Terms

Executive Summary

The university shall establish an academic calendar that includes:

- 16-week (instruction + finals) fall and spring semesters
- summer term that offers variable length sessions
- winter intersession period for instruction
- two 7.5-week modules in both the fall and spring semesters

The Academic Senate

- shall designate appropriate collaborative committees to establish additional guidelines regarding the winter intersession period and modules
- strongly recommends that winter intersession courses and summer sessions be offered through state-side support to ensure equitable access for all students

Part 1: Semester Term Lengths

Background

The quarter-to-semester conversion process requires the alteration of the academic term length at Cal Poly beginning in fall 2026. Academic terms are governed by existing policies regarding the number of instructional days during the academic year and the number of workdays required by faculty members during the academic year. According to the 2022-24 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), “The work year of an academic year employee shall not exceed one hundred eighty (180) workdays or days in lieu thereof. This provision shall not preclude the establishment of an academic year calendar equaling less than one hundred eighty (180) days. The campus academic calendar shall establish workdays of academic year employees” (20.4). According to the Campus Administrative Policies (CAP), “The typical academic year shall consist of 147 instructional days. From year-to-year a variation of plus or minus two days is permissible. There shall be a minimum of 170 academic workdays in the academic year. There shall be a maximum of 180 academic workdays in the academic year” (CAP 211.1). Currently, the academic year is divided into three quarters (Fall, Winter, Spring). The summer session is not considered part of the academic year. Every year, the academic calendar proposals are reviewed by various stakeholders across campus, including department chairs and heads, deans, members of Student Affairs, the Academic Senate Instruction Committee, and the Academic Senate Executive Committee, and the President determines the academic calendar. Across the California State System, each campus establishes its own start and end date for academic terms, including the length of the final examination period (see Table 1).
Establishment of Semester Term Length

To comply with the Chancellor’s Office requirement that Cal Poly convert from quarters to semesters beginning in 2026, the university shall establish an academic calendar that includes a 16-week fall semester (15 weeks of instruction and a 1-week final examination period) and a 16-week spring semester (15 weeks of instruction and a 1-week final examination period). The total number of instructional days and total academic workdays shall follow the requirements of the CBA and CAP.

To increase student access to classes and maintain progress to degree, the summer term shall continue to offer variable length sessions. Because of calendar limitations, a sixteen-week term is not possible in the summer. The Academic Senate strongly recommends that the summer session be offered through state-side support to ensure equitable access for all students. The Academic Senate shall designate an appropriate committee (or committees) to collaborate with the Office of the Registrar and other campus stakeholders across the university to establish additional guidelines regarding summer session.

Part 2: Intersession Terms

Background

As part of the Graduate Initiative 2025 (GI 2025), the California State University has prioritized student access to classes, graduation rates, and student success.¹ Cal Poly has consistently made progress toward the GI 2025 targets for 4- and 6-year First-Time Student and 2- and 4-year Transfer Student graduation rates and in eliminating graduate gaps (see Tables 2 and 3).

---

To provide increased student access to classes and maintain student progress to degree, 13 of the 23 California State University campuses offer a winter and/or May intersession periods.

Table 2: Cal Poly Graduation Rates 2018-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>CSU ESTABLISHED 2025 TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Student 4-year</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Student 6-year</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Student 2-year</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Student 4-year</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Cal Poly Gap Data 2018-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>CSU ESTABLISHED TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented Minority 6-year Gap</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>No Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recipient 6-year Gap</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>No Gap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishment of an Intersession Period

To increase student access to classes, maintain student progress to degree, and facilitate Cal Poly’s progress toward the CSU’s GI 2025 targets, the university shall establish an academic calendar that includes a winter intersession period for instruction that maintains a reasonable alignment with the spring semester start and end dates of other campuses in the California State University system. Intersession courses shall follow the credit hour requirements established by the WASC Senior College and University Commission’s “Credit Hour Policy” and the Academic Senate “Resolution on Review of Courses with Condensed Time Schedules” (AS-838-17) (see Background Information).

The Academic Senate shall designate an appropriate committee (or committees) to collaborate with the Office of the Registrar and other campus stakeholders across the university to establish additional guidelines regarding the winter intersession period. The Academic Senate strongly recommends that winter intersession courses be offered through state-side support to ensure equitable access for all students.

Part 3: Establishment of Modules

Background

Several polytechnic universities on the semester system offer modules during within the semester terms to achieve their academic goals. Rochester Institute of Technology offers 7-week online sessions every semester (see https://www.rit.edu/calendar). Worcester Polytechnic Institute offers 7-week sessions across 5 different terms (https://go2.wpi.edu/wpi-
online-term-start-dates). A prominent non-polytechnic university, Arizona State University, offers two 7.5-week sessions, both online and in-person, every semester (https://students.asu.edu/academic-calendar). As Cal Poly converts from quarters to semester, modules within the semester provide the opportunity to advance the university’s mission as a comprehensive polytechnic university.

Establishment of Modules within Semester Terms

The university shall establish an academic calendar that includes two 7.5-week modules in the fall semester and two 7.5-week modules in the spring semester. Courses offered through modules shall follow the credit hour requirements established by the WASC Senior College and University Commission’s “Credit Hour Policy” and the Academic Senate “Resolution on Review of Courses with Condensed Time Schedules” (AS-838-17) (see Background Information).

The Academic Senate shall designate an appropriate committee (or committees) to collaborate with the Office of the Registrar and other campus stakeholders across the university to establish additional guidelines regarding modules.
Part 4: Background Information

Credit Hour Policy

Academic credit has provided the basis to measure the amount of engaged learning time expected of a student enrolled in traditional classroom settings, laboratories, studios, internships, independent studies, and distance education programs. Credit hours are a commonly accepted means of measuring student engagement for multiple purposes, including the transfer of students from one institution to another and the award of financial aid. While this credit hour policy is intended to provide guidance to institutions and peer reviewers with expectations for compliance, the Commission is open to innovative ways to measure student learning and academic engagement.

Definition of Credit Hour

The Commission defines credit hour as an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that

1. Approximates not less than:
   a. One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or 10 to 12 weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or
   b. At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph 1.a. of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours; and

2. Permits an institution, in determining the amount of work associated with a credit hour, to take into account a variety of delivery methods, measurements of student work, academic calendars, disciplines and degree levels. Institutions have the flexibility to award a greater number of credits for courses that they can show require more student work.

Review of an Institution’s Credit Hour Policy and Procedures

Commission peer review teams will evaluate, as part of all seeking accreditation and comprehensive reviews for reaffirmation of accreditation, the extent to which institutions meet the Commission’s definition of a credit hour, by examining:
1. The adoption of a policy on credit hour for all courses and programs at the institution.
2. The processes the institution employs to review periodically the application of its policy on credit hour across the institution to assure that credit hour assignments are accurate, reliable, and consistently applied.
3. Any variations in the assignment of credit hours to assure that they conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education.

In implementing this policy, teams will use the Credit Hour and Program Length Form to review institutional documentation:
- The institution’s policy on credit hour including expectations at each degree level;
- An explanation of the institution’s process for periodic review of the application of this policy;
- Evidence of the implementation of institutional review processes to assure the reliability and accuracy of credit hour assignments in all courses and programs; for example, as part of program review, process for new course approval, or periodic audits; and
- Evidence that the institution’s assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education, through sampling a variety of course syllabi based on degree level, academic discipline, delivery modes, and types of academic activities.

In addition, the substantive change committee process includes a review of credit hour assignments and validation of an institution’s credit hour policy. Additional protocols for implementation of this policy may be developed to assist institutions and teams in conducting reviews under this policy.

Approved by the Commission, November 2011
Revised, November 2020
Adopted: June 6, 2017

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

AS-838-17

RESOLUTION ON
REVIEW OF COURSES WITH CONDENSED TIME SCHEDULES

WHEREAS, Courses are being re-packaged in new and interesting ways, including international studies classes, during time periods outside of the traditional ten-week quarter, or as summer experiences; and

WHEREAS, No Academic Senate Curriculum Committee review is currently required for these types of course offerings except for when the courses are originally proposed; and

WHEREAS, Coded Memorandum AA-2011-14 from the Chancellor's Office defines a credit hour as "the amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than: one hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out-of-class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time"; and

WHEREAS, A one-unit course during a quarter translates to approximately 30 total hours of student work; and

WHEREAS, It may prove difficult to attain the approved Course Learning Objectives if students are expected to work more than 10 hours in any given day; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That any existing course or group of courses that in its new condensed format averages less than three days per unit must be approved by the appropriate College Curriculum Committee(s) and the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee at least 60 days before they are offered.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: May 3, 2017
MEMORANDUM
Cal Poly | Office of the President

To: Dustin Stegner
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jeffrey D. Armstrong
President

Date: July 17, 2017

Copies: K. Enz Finken
M. Pedersen
B. Tietje
C. Moore
C. Sunata
G. Bohr

Subject: Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-838-17
Resolution on Review of Courses with Condensed Time Schedules

This memo acknowledges receipt of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution. I understand from the resolve clause that resolution AS-838-17, as approved by the Academic Senate, only applies to existing courses that have not yet been offered in a condensed format, averaging less than three days per unit. I expect that the Academic Senate, Academic Programs and Planning, and the Office of the Registrar will work together to resolve any processual issues related to the proposed curricular review.
RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH PROCESSES FOR CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM PROPOSAL REVIEW FOR CONVERSION TO SEMESTERS

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

WHEREAS, the California State Legislature has mandated in Assembly Bill 928: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act a revision to general education in the California State University system beginning in Fall 2025; and,

WHEREAS, the conversion of Cal Poly’s curriculum and academic programs requires a review of every course (4,320 total courses) and academic program (undergraduate and graduate degree programs, minors, concentrations, options, credentials, emphases, specializations) on a variety of timelines between 2022-2026; and,

WHEREAS, in terms of university-level curriculum and academic program proposal review, the different timelines necessitate a significantly increased workload for the chairs and committee members of the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, General Education Governance Board, and United States Cultural Pluralism Review Committee; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate approve the attached “Procedures for Curricular and Program Proposal Review, 2022-26.”

Proposed by: Academic Senate Ad Hoc Semester Conversion Committee

Date: May 13, 2022
Executive Summary

As part of the quarter-to-semester conversion, the university shall establish

- Curricular review for all courses
- Program proposal review for all academic programs: undergraduate and graduate degree programs, minors, concentrations, options, specializations, credentials, emphases, and certificates

The Academic Senate shall

- Charge appropriate university-wide review committees—Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, General Education Governance Board, and United States Cultural Pluralism Review Committee—to coordinate with the academic colleges to complete curricular and program proposal review for the quarter-to-semester conversion

Part 1: Academic Conversion Plan

Introduction

The quarter-to-semester conversion requires a review of all curricula and academic programs (undergraduate and graduate degree programs, minors, concentrations, options, specializations, credentials, emphases, and certificates). To facilitate these review processes, each academic department shall complete an Academic Conversion Plan for each of its academic degrees (undergraduate and graduate), minors, concentrations, options, specializations, credentials, emphases, and certificates. The Academic Conversion Plan is a concise overview of course and program revisions. Each department shall submit their Academic Conversion Plan(s) to the appropriate college curriculum committee for review and approval by January 27, 2023. Academic Conversion Plans will be published online so that academic departments can coordinate their course offerings. The process during Winter 2023 will be dynamic and iterative as departments work together to meet program requirements. The deadline for final approval of Academic Conversion Plans by College Curriculum committees will be March 17, 2023.

A. Academic Conversion Plan

The first part of the plan will be the Course Identification Section. This section shall

1. Identify each course offered by the department as New, Significantly Revised, Converted, or Discontinued. (See Part 2: Course Review Processes for course proposal categories and definitions)
2. Identify the number of semester-units for each course

The second part of the plan will be the Academic Conversion Section. This section shall
1. Identify each academic program offered by the department as New, Significantly Revised, Converted, or Discontinued (See Part 3: Program Proposal Review Processes for academic program proposal categories and definitions)
2. Identify all of the required major courses required for the academic program
3. Identify all of the support courses required for the program offered by other departments
4. Identify all electives offered within the department and by other departments
5. Identify the semester-unit totals for the academic program.

Part 2: Course Review Processes

A. Course Proposal Categories and Definitions
As part of the quarter-to-semester conversion, all courses must undergo curricular review. Courses will be divided into four categories that will determine the type of review to be applied (see Table 1 below). To provide a clear structure for this review, the curricular review process has been divided into five workflows:

1. New or Significantly Revised Non-General Education Courses
2. Converted Non-General Education Courses
3. New or Significantly Revised General Education Courses
4. Converted General Education Courses
5. Discontinued Courses

All courses will be submitted using the Course Management Inventory (CIM) and reviewed by the appropriate department/program curriculum committee, department head/chair, college curriculum committee, college associate dean, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, and, finally, by the Academic Senate. Where required, courses will also be reviewed by the appropriate university curriculum review committees: United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) Committee, Graduation Writing Requirement (GWR) Committee, and/or General Education Governance Board (GEGB). For specific workflow paths, see Diagram 1. To distinguish between the quarter and semester catalogs, all courses will be assigned a new course number by the Office of the Registrar.

Table 1: Course Categories and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New</td>
<td>• New course that does not appear in the 2022-2025 Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Significantly Revised</td>
<td>• Course that has modified 50% or more of its course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course that has significantly modified 50% or more of its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) or course criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course currently has no Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and is adding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>them for the 2026-27 Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course revised to satisfy General Education (GE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recertification (AB 928 EO) criteria or adding GE designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Converted | Course revised to satisfy United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) criteria (AS-910-21) or adding USCP designation  
Course revised to satisfy Graduate Writing Requirement (AS-858-18) or adding GWR designation  
Course open non-majors that has changed its mode  
Changing course from lower to upper division or vice versa  
Adding course prerequisites outside of the college  
Course that has modified less than 50% of its course content  
Course that has modified less than 50% of its Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) or course criteria  
Course restricted to majors that has changed its mode  
Changing units with the quarter-unit to semester-unit ratio (e.g. 4 quarter-unit Lecture/Seminar/Discussion to 3 semester units; 1 quarter unit Laboratory to 1 semester unit)  
Changing course title or description for clarity  
Removing and adding prerequisites within the college  
Minimal changes to course title, course description, and descriptions in the Course Delivery and Resources section of the Course Inventory Management  
Adding or removing modalities  
Retention of existing articulation for lower-division courses (100-200 level). (Departments that do not want their existing articulation to carry over can request this through the Articulation Officer in the Office of the Registrar.) |
| 4. Discontinued | Course will be discontinued at the conclusion of the 2022-2025 Catalog |
Diagram 1: Curricular Review Workflow, Including Compensation for Faculty Members and Staff for Summer 2023
B. Curricular Review Timelines

The timeline for curricular review depends on compensation available to faculty members and staff. This timeline is subject to change given faculty and support compensation for summer 2022 and summer 2024 and additional requirements related to conversion mandated by the Chancellor’s Office. Guidelines from the Chancellor’s Office related to AB 928 could also affect the timeline for General Education course review.

Table 2: Curricular Review Timeline, Including Faculty and Staff Support for Summer 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2022</th>
<th>Each academic department categorizes courses as New/Significantly Revised, Converted, or Discontinued in its Academic Conversion Plan and submits its plan to the appropriate college curriculum committee. (Please note: GE Courses can be categorized for the Academic Conversion Plan, but full course proposals cannot be submitted until the Chancellor’s Office releases AB 928 Requirements and New GE Template)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 27th, 2023</td>
<td>Submission of Academic Conversion Plan(s) to College Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2023</td>
<td>College Curriculum Committee Review of Academic Conversion Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 2023</td>
<td>Deadline for Academic Conversion Plan Approval by College Curriculum Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. 2023-Su. 2023</td>
<td>Department and College-Level Review of Curriculum and Program Proposals by College Curriculum Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Summer 2023</td>
<td>Courses and program proposals due to the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2023</td>
<td>Catalog &amp; Curriculum Team review Proposals in preparation for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 2024 to W 2025</td>
<td>USCP, GWR, and ASCC review 2026-27 Catalog proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2024-W 2025</td>
<td>GEGB reviews 2026-27 Catalog proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2025</td>
<td>Complete Catalog Review and incorporate GE Pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. and Su. 2025</td>
<td>Build and publish 2026-27 Catalog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3: Program Proposal Review Processes

A. Program Proposal Categories and Definitions

As part of the quarter-to-semester conversion, all academic programs must undergo review. Academic programs include degree programs (undergraduate and graduate), minors, concentrations, options, specializations, credentials, emphases, and certificates. Academic programs will be divided into four categories that will determine the type of review to be applied (see Table 4 below). To provide a clear structure for this review, the academic program proposal review process has been divided into five workflows:

1. New Degree Program (undergraduate or graduate), Minor, Concentration, Option, Specialization, Credential, Emphasis, or Certificate
2. **Significantly Revised Degree Program (undergraduate or graduate), Minor, Concentration, Option, Specialization, Credential, Emphasis, or Certificate**

3. **Converted Degree Program (undergraduate or graduate), Minor, Concentration, Option, Specialization, Credential, Emphasis, or Certificate**

4. **Discontinued Minor, Concentration, Option, Specialization, Credential, Emphasis, or Certificate**

5. **Discontinued Degree Program (undergraduate and graduate)**

All academic programs will be reviewed by the appropriate department/program curriculum committee, department head/chair, college curriculum committee, college associate dean, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, and, finally, by the Academic Senate. Following California State University Policy, all newly proposed academic programs must also be submitted to the Chancellor’s Office to review.

**Please Note:** The Chancellor’s Office has not provided guidelines for program proposal review of quarter to semester conversion for high-unit programs (programs that exceed 180-quarter units or would exceed 120-semester conversion units). All categories, definitions, and workflow processes for program conversion are subject to revision, pending requirements of the Chancellor’s Office.

### Table 3: Program Categories and Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>• New Degree Program that does not appear in the 2022-2025 Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Please note:</em> New Degree Programs (undergraduate and graduate) shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>follow the preestablished university procedures and timelines. Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on the Academic Programs and Planning website:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/academicpolicies/new-degrees">https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/academicpolicies/new-degrees</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New Minor, Concentration, Certificate, Option, or Emphasis that does not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appear in the 2022-25 Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Please note:</em> New Minor, Concentration, Certificate, Option, or Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may require approval from the Chancellor’s Office. Please consult with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Programs and Planning for guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significantly Revised</td>
<td>• Significant changes to an undergraduate or graduate degree program,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including the following modifications:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Minimal changes to a Degree Program (undergraduate or graduate), Minor, Certificate, Option, or Emphasis including the following modifications:</td>
<td>▪ Discontinuation of Degree Program (undergraduate or graduate), Minor, Concentration, Certificate, Option, or Emphasis that appears in the 2022-25 Catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Contraction or expansion of course sequences due to the new semester term length</td>
<td>Please note: Discontinuation of Degree Program (undergraduate and graduate) shall follow the preestablished procedures and timelines. Available on the Academic Programs and Planning website: <a href="https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/academicpolicies/discontinuance">https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/academicpolicies/discontinuance</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Changing course sequences to align more effectively with semester term length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Adding or removing electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Timeline for Academic Program Proposal Review**

The timeline for academic program proposal review is dependent on support models available to faculty members and staff. This timeline is subject to change given faculty and support
compensation for summer 2022 and summer 2024. The timeline with faculty and staff support may be found in Table 4. This timeline is subject to change given faculty and support compensation for summer 2022 and summer 2024 and additional requirements related to conversion mandated by the Chancellor’s Office.

Table 4: Timeline for Academic Program Proposal Review, including Faculty and Staff Support for Summer 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2023</td>
<td>Each academic department submits its Academic Program Plan to the appropriate college curriculum committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 2023</td>
<td>Deadline for Academic Program Plan Approval by College Curriculum Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2023</td>
<td>Program proposals due to the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2023</td>
<td>Catalog &amp; Curriculum Team review Proposals in preparation for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 2024 to W 2025</td>
<td>ASCC reviews 2026-27 Catalog proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. and Su. 2025</td>
<td>Build and publish 2026-27 Catalog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4: Compensation Models for Academic Senate Curriculum Committees

Currently, members of the Academic Senate curriculum committees – Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC), General Education Governance Board (GEGB), and United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) Review Committee – receive different levels of support time for their respective chairs and members (see Table 6). As part of the quarter to semester conversion curriculum review process, the workload on these committee will be significantly increased, as indicated in the different workflows in Diagrams 1 and 2.

The appropriate level for support for Academic Senate curriculum committee chairs and members for the 2023-24 and 2024-25 Academic Years, excluding summers, are indicated in Table 5.

Table 5: Compensation for Academic Senate Curriculum Committee Chairs and Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Committee</th>
<th>2024-25</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee Chair</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses to Review 4,230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Governance Board Chair</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429 Courses to Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>8 (4x2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>8 (4x2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCP Review Committee Chair</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 Courses to Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Academic Senate Assigned Time, 2017-23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee Chair</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Governance Board</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCP Review Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4: Background Information

Diagram 3: CSU AB-928 Timeline

- **2021**
  - October 6, 2021: AB-928 signed

- **2022**
  - March 1, 2022: Designate CSU/ED member to ARTIC

- **2023**
  - December 13, 2023: Recommendations due to the Legislature
  - May 31, 2023: Establish common GE pathway
  - December 31, 2023: Establish common GE if IASC is unable

- **2024**
  - January-May 2024: Review DEU GE policy to conform to new single GE pattern
  - March 2024: Title 5 changes for GE to BOT for information
  - May 2024: Title 5 changes for GE to BOT for action
  - August 1, 2024: Must place students on an A-B

- **2025**
  - Fall 2025: Single GE Begins
  - Associate Degree for Transfer intersegmental implementation committee (ADITIC)
  - Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS)
  - CCC/CBIV/C Administration
  - CSU BOT and CSUCO
  - California Community Colleges (OCC)
Impact on Existing Policy¹: (3) Reaffirmation of existing curricular and scheduling policies approved by the Academic Senate and University President, specifically AS-453-96CC: “Resolution on Standardizing Course Units”; AS-748-12: “Resolution on Shared Governance”; AS-835-17: “Resolution on Proposing New Courses or other Changes to Curricula”; and AS-922-21: “Resolution on How Credit Hour Policy Adherence Is Assessed and Assured.”

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, The California State University has set the requirements for the number of contact hours scheduled per unit of credit²; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, Standardizing courses to four or more units can occur while preserving:
- the total number of units required in a degree
- the number of SCU taught per term
- the number of faculty members required to teach the curriculum
- the number of laboratory units taught and hence Cal Poly's traditional commitment to hands-on education; and
RESOLUTION ON STANDARDIZING COURSE UNITS
AS-453-96/CC
Page Two

WHEREAS, In a university curriculum, courses with fewer than four units may be desirable in the following cases:
   - activity or laboratory classes (PE, Art, Music, etc.)
   - classes taught in the supervision mode
   - orientation classes
   - library classes
   - coupled classes (e.g., lecture and labs taken concurrently but listed separately)

therefore, be it

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

Proposed by the Academic Senate
Curriculum Committee
January 26, 1996
Revised April 9, 1996
To: Harvey Greenwald  
   Chair, Academic Senate  

Date: April 24, 1996

From: Warren J. Baker  
   President

Copies: P. Zingg, G.Irvin  
   T. Zuur, D. Arseneau

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution AS-453-96/CC  
   Resolution on Standardizing Course Units

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board

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

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

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

4. The Academic Institution: The President

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

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for the institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of the president's administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, the president may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty but may also, in the interest of academic standards, seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Notes

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

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

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

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

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

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

Date: September 20, 2012

From: Elizabeth Kinsley  
Chief of Staff

Subject: Academic Senate Resolution AS-748-12

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, Current campus procedures establish the workflow for proposing new curricula: the Office of the Registrar states that “Proposals for new courses are developed by faculty and submitted for approval through the Curriculum Management system,” (http://registrar.calpoly.edu/course-policies-guidelines#Propose%20%20New%20), and Academic Senate Bylaws (VIII.I.2b) state that “[t]he Curriculum Committee evaluates curriculum proposals from departments and colleges;” and

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

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

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

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

Date: December 5, 2016
Revised: April 19, 2017
Footnotes:
1 Constitution of the Faculty and the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Article III, Section 2.

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

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

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

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

To: Dustin Stegner
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jeffrey D. Armstrong
President

Date: October 25, 2017

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

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

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

Please extend my thanks to the Academic Senate members for their attention to this matter.
### Scheduling Time Patterns

**Prime Time** = 9 am - 3 pm

**REMINDER**: 50% of scheduled lecture classes should be outside of Prime Time hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MW, WF, MF 4 units (220 min/wk)</th>
<th>MWF 3 units (150 min/wk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:10am-8:00am</td>
<td>8:10am-10:00am</td>
<td>8:10am-10:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10am-9:00am</td>
<td>10:10am-12:00pm</td>
<td>10:10am-12:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10am-10:00am</td>
<td>12:10pm-2:00pm</td>
<td>12:10pm-2:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10am-11:00am</td>
<td>2:10pm-4:00pm</td>
<td>2:10pm-4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10am-12:00pm</td>
<td>4:10pm-6:00pm</td>
<td>4:10pm-6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10pm-1:00pm</td>
<td>6:10pm-8:00pm</td>
<td>6:10pm-8:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10pm-2:00pm</td>
<td>7:10pm-9:00pm</td>
<td>7:10pm-9:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10pm-3:00pm</td>
<td>8:10pm-10:00pm</td>
<td>8:10pm-10:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>TR 3 units (160 min/wk)</th>
<th>TR 4 units (220 min/wk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:10am-9:00am</td>
<td>7:40am-9:00am</td>
<td>7:10am-9:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10am-9:30am</td>
<td>8:10am-9:30am</td>
<td>9:10am-11:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10am-11:00am</td>
<td>9:40am-11:00am</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10am-12:00am</td>
<td>12:10pm-1:30pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10am-12:00am</td>
<td>1:40pm-3:00pm</td>
<td>2:10pm-4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10am-2:00pm</td>
<td>3:10pm-4:30pm</td>
<td>4:10pm-6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10am-2:00pm</td>
<td>4:10pm-5:30pm</td>
<td>5:10pm-7:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10am-3:00pm</td>
<td>5:10pm-6:30pm</td>
<td>6:10pm-8:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10am-4:00pm</td>
<td>6:10pm-7:00pm</td>
<td>7:10pm-9:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10am-5:00pm</td>
<td>7:10pm-9:00pm</td>
<td>8:10pm-10:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>LABS (3 hrs/wk)</th>
<th>Any 4 days/wk 4 units (200 min/wk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:10am-11:00am</td>
<td>8:10am-11:00am</td>
<td>7:10am-8:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10am-12:00am</td>
<td>9:10am-11:00am</td>
<td>8:10am-9:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10am-11:00am</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>9:10am-10:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10am-12:00am</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>10:10am-11:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10am-1:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>11:10am-12:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10am-2:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>12:10pm-1:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10am-3:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>1:10pm-2:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10am-4:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>2:10pm-3:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10am-5:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>3:10pm-4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10am-6:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>4:10pm-5:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10am-7:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>5:10pm-6:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10am-8:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>6:10pm-7:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10am-9:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>7:10pm-8:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10am-10:00am</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
<td>8:10am-9:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MW/TR 4 units 4 units (250 min/wk)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:10am-8:00am</td>
<td>8:10am-9:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10am-9:00am</td>
<td>9:10am-10:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10am-10:00am</td>
<td>10:10am-11:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10am-11:00am</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10am-11:00am</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10pm-1:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10pm-2:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10pm-3:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10pm-4:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10pm-5:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10pm-6:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10pm-7:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10pm-8:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10pm-9:00pm</td>
<td>University Hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STUDIO SCHEDULE**

- Lecture and Lab taught back to back in **studio** pattern.
- Select two of the above in consecutive pattern. Must be in department controlled space.
- *Ex. TR 8:10-9:30am (Lect) | TR 9:40-11am (Lab)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Area</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>San Jose</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
<th>San Bernardino</th>
<th>Channel Islands</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Pomona</th>
<th>Bakersfield</th>
<th>Fresno</th>
<th>East Bay</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>Sanoma State</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Northridge</th>
<th>San Marcos</th>
<th>Chico</th>
<th>Fullerton</th>
<th>Dominguez Hills</th>
<th>Stanislaus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Columns indicate the number of GE courses that are 4 semester units or higher.
RESOLUTION ON HOW CREDIT HOUR POLICY ADHERENCE IS ASSESSED AND ASSURED

Impact on Existing Policy:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Sources.**

Academic Senate Resolution [AS-838-17]: “Resolution on Review of Courses with Condensed Time Schedules.”

Academic Senate Resolution [AS-896-20]: “Resolution on Online Teaching and Learning.”

California State University Coded Memorandum [AA 2011-14]: “CSU Definition of Credit Hour” (revised October 2011).

California State University Office of the Chancellor, “Update to Federal Definition of the Student Credit Hour,” official memorandum (December 21, 2020).

WSCUC (WASC Senior College and University Commission), “Credit Hour Policy” (revised November 2020).
MEMORANDUM

To: Thomas Gutierrez
    Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jeffery D. Armstrong
      President

Date: June 7, 2021

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

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

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

Please extend my thanks to the members of the Academic Senate for their attention to this important matter.
RESOLUTION ON THE CREATION OF A SCHOOL OF APPLIED COMPUTING

Impact on Existing Policy: NONE

WHEREAS, applied computing is an inherently multidisciplinary endeavor, transcending the confines of a single department; and

WHEREAS, “applied computing” shall be defined as the broad range of fields that contribute to the meaningful advancement and application of computing technology, including the design, operation, and implementation of computational technology, regardless of discipline; and

WHEREAS, the creation of a distinct academic unit supporting applied computing provides unique opportunities for coordinated growth, interdisciplinary research and education, and a stronger sense of identity for computing students and faculty; and

WHEREAS, the College of Engineering (CENG) has identified an endowment for creating a collaborative, academic unit residing within CENG called the School of Applied Computing; and

WHEREAS, the founding Departments of the School of Applied Computing are the Computer Engineering, Computer Science and Software Engineering, and Electrical Engineering departments; and

WHEREAS, the mission, vision, and structure of the School of Applied Computing are provided in the attachment to this resolution; and

WHEREAS, the creation of the School of Applied Computing in mission, vision, structure, and name has been overwhelmingly approved and endorsed by the Computer Engineering, Computer Science and Software Engineering, and Electrical Engineering Department faculty, Chairs, and the Dean of the College of Engineering; therefore be it
RESOLVED: the mission, vision, and structure of the School of Applied Computing contained in the attachment to this resolution be adopted, and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo approve the creation of the School of Applied Computing.

Proposed by: School of Applied Computing Steering Committee
Date: April 19, 2022
A Proposal for a Cal Poly
School of Applied Computing

Ben Hawkins
Electrical Engineering

John Oliver
Computer Engineering

Zachary Peterson¹
Computer Science and
Software Engineering

School of Applied Computing Steering Committee

Overview

We propose the creation of a new academic unit², endowed within the College of Engineering (CENG) and called the School of Applied Computing (SoAC), to advance the broad field of computing and its applications at Cal Poly. The School will be founded by three departments within CENG–Computer Engineering (CPE), Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE), and Electrical Engineering (EE)–representing the core disciplines in Applied Computing within the College of Engineering from information processing to cyberphysical systems. Overseen by a Director and a Council of stakeholders, the SoAC will fund research and curriculum development projects, support advanced applied computing infrastructure, sponsor multidisciplinary and interdepartmental events, and represent Applied Computing disciplines across Cal Poly to the world. These founding departments have a history of interconnected curriculum and a collective expertise in applied computing. Facilitated by the SoAC, they will work together jointly with faculty and students from across the University in Learn by Doing experiences focused on computing and its myriad applications. The School will represent over 2200 students, a population more than 20% larger than the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, and its creation will allow Cal Poly to better serve its educational mission by providing new Learn by Doing opportunities in applied computing for all students, support the professional and personal development of the School’s staff and faculty, and advance the field of applied computing through research and scholarship.

The specific benefits of the creation of the School of Applied Computing are manifold and will enrich the entire University, including:

- Advancing educational opportunities in applied computing in multiple departments and colleges

¹ Committee Chair
² As defined by Academic Programs and Planning in: https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/reorganization-academic-programs-and-academic-units-and-suspension-programs#:~:text=Academic%20unit%3A%20A%20department%2C%20school.home%20or%20an%20academic%20program
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• Developing opportunities (via funding and infrastructure) for scholarship\(^3\) in applied computing
• Providing cohesive visibility and a distinct, nationwide reputation for Cal Poly in applied computing

**Rationale & Benefits**

In recent years, computing has grown into a broad discipline that no longer neatly fits within a single department, nor the colleges in which those departments reside. Computing and its associated disciplines are integral to almost every area of science and engineering, and whose value is universal throughout a University. As such, many universities have considered and implemented independent academic structures (*i.e.*, a “college” or “school” of computing), consisting of students and faculty to support the advancement of the computing disciplines and provide new opportunities for multidisciplinary research and education. Examples include the MIT Schwarzman College of Computing, the Carnegie Mellon School of Computer Science, the Paul G. Allen School of Computer Science at the University of Washington, and the School of Computing and Design at CSU Monterey Bay.

When considering a similar academic unit at Cal Poly, it is important that we reflect upon the distinct Cal Poly mission\(^4\), and the strengths that differentiate our University: a primary focus on undergraduate education, our Learn by Doing pedagogical approach, and the applied nature of our scholarly pursuits. As such, we envision the creation of a School of Applied Computing (SoAC). In contrast to the schools of “Computing” and “Computer Science” being established at other institutions, such as those listed above, the Cal Poly SoAC will be a unique entity that will nurture, unite, and amplify interests and capabilities in applied computing scholarship and will elevate our pedagogy in applied computing through our successful “Learn By Doing” philosophy.

The creation of a School of Applied Computing has the potential to provide Cal Poly myriad opportunities and benefits, including:

**Enhanced Opportunities for Multidisciplinary Research.** Our opportunity to establish the SoAC as an endowed school presents an impactful set of opportunities to immediately benefit Cal Poly faculty and students engaged in the broad field of applied computing scholarship. It is anticipated that the School will offer funding opportunities for academic year and summer research projects for faculty and students in the School as well as those collaborating on applied computing projects across the University.

The SoAC will serve as an amplifier of existing applied computing research projects, forging cross-campus connections, and seeding the next generation of research ideas. As such, the School will create a nexus on campus for applied computing expertise,

---

\(^3\) The term “scholarship” refers to academic and applied research, as well as pedagogical research and curricular development, and industry engagement. It is exclusive of currently existing coursework and curricula.

\(^4\) Defined here: [https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/cal-poly-mission-statement](https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/cal-poly-mission-statement)
which eases collaboration between the School's faculty, and better positions the University to respond to and support research projects spanning the University's Departments and Colleges, driving Cal Poly’s applied computing activities forward.

Examples of multidisciplinary projects that could benefit from the SoAC:

- High performance computing systems and its applications
- Computer simulations for a wide array of application spaces (e.g. modeling, design, and optimization problems in circuits, electronics, and power systems; signals, systems, and controls; and networking and communications systems).
- Research and applications in computer entertainment, graphics, and visualization including augmented and artificial reality.
- Applications of artificial intelligence and machine learning (e.g. computer vision, distributed sensors, robotics, and autonomous systems).
- Research and development of ASIC/SOC systems and next-generation IC devices.
- Internet of Things (IoT) applications (e.g. medical devices, cloud computing, low-power devices).
- Quantum computing including simulation of quantum computers, quantum algorithms, and quantum programming languages.
- Computer security, including intersections with privacy and ethics.

**Brand, Identity, and Collaboration.** Applied computing crosses boundaries and disciplines, and an SoAC can provide a shared identity and belonging for students, staff, and faculty engaged in applied computing education and research activities, creating a cohesive community and coherent “brand.” A clear identity further helps with establishing a distinct nationwide reputation, which can attract the most talented students and faculty to the School. Enhanced faculty recruiting will be a clear benefit in an increasingly competitive talent market. Industry engagement with the School will enable multiple paths for career planning and job opportunities, creating options for each student to find their best vocational fit.

The SoAC will provide a platform for fundraising, attracting and supporting sponsored projects, and creating new opportunities for professional development. Supporting more targeted advancement efforts may lead to enhanced fundraising for applied computing.

The SoAC will also facilitate new opportunities for collaborations and social interactions between the member Departments. Examples include a regular speaker series where affiliated faculty share their current research and interests, “speed dating” events where faculty find new possibilities for collaborative projects, or other social gatherings and celebrations to promote friendship, good will, and camaraderie.

**Enhanced Educational Opportunities.** The founding departments in the SoAC will be the Computer Engineering (CPE), Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE),
and Electrical Engineering (EE) Departments. These three departments have a long history of interconnected curriculum and student/faculty experience around applied computing. Many faculty and instructional staff share joint appointments, facilities are shared, and there is a significant amount of student interest in courses and degree programs offered across the Departments. Additionally, the interdisciplinary nature of applied computing results in an increasing number of students from outside the founding departments interested in taking courses in applied computing topics. An SoAC can work across departmental boundaries to develop new mechanisms for both identifying and satisfying these needs. The SoAC will provide a unique platform for the Departments to explore additional collaborative opportunities with the rest of the University, to introduce unique educational opportunities, and to reduce barriers to student success.

Coordinated curricular efforts could also ameliorate challenges associated with rapidly expanding enrollment. For example, by better management of curricular offerings, and by expanding the variety of courses and educational programs that meet program learning objectives, students can move more swiftly toward completing their educational goals. These actions and more—such as minors and concentrations in applied computing disciplines—provide clear benefits to students and faculty, but present challenges to coordinate without an organizing body and unified voice.

While impractical and unwise to enact all at once, these potential benefits, timed with an opportunity for endowment, makes the creation of the SoAC an extremely promising and felicitous opportunity for Cal Poly, as a whole.

**Process to Establish the School of Applied Computing**

Establishing a School of Applied Computing has been an on-going, consultative process that has consisted of a variety of reporting and feedback methods including surveys, listening sessions, one-on-one and departmental meetings, and consultation with all members of the three founding departments (Computer Engineering, Computer Science and Software Engineering, and Electrical Engineering), their respective Chairs, the Dean of the College of Engineering, the Engineering Dean's College Council, Engineering faculty/staff at the college-wide meeting, and the Provost-College Deans meetings. Additionally, Dean Fleischer has consulted with and received support from the Provost throughout the process as well as the other academic Deans.

While the idea for a School or College of Computing at Cal Poly (in some form) has existed for years prior to this proposal, the initial steps towards the School of Applied Computing as envisioned here were made in early January 2022 when the Dean of the College of Engineering approached the College Council and founding member Departments with the news of an identified donor and potential endowment for the School. Shortly thereafter, this Steering Committee was formed and tasked with creating a mission, vision, and initial structure for the School.
As a first step toward that goal, the Steering Committee conducted surveys of the member Departments to solicit a set of guiding principles and potential activities. The result is a range of ideas, values, and intentions for the School. An initial definition of “applied computing,” mission and vision statements, along with this proposal were drafted and shared with constituent faculty. Iterative rounds of consultation were made through Winter Quarter, including a joint listening session held in February (virtually) and two in March (in-person). The Steering Committee also made regular reports to the Departments and Chairs throughout Winter Quarter by email and visits to departmental meetings. The Chair of the Steering Committee met weekly with the Dean of the College of Engineering during this same time to both report on the Committee's progress and coordinate on strategy and messaging outside of the College.

A vote on the commitment to support the School of Applied Computing as outlined in this proposal was made by the three founding member Departments in the first week of April 2022. The results were overwhelmingly in favor, with a final tally of 54 in support, and one against.

As we move toward an anticipated resolution by the Academic Senate in Spring 2022, the consultative process will continue particularly with those outside the School and College. Indeed, evolving the mission, vision, and structure to meet the broader Cal Poly community's applied computing needs is a core tenet of the School.

Definition, Mission and Vision

Through its consultative and iterative process, the Steering Committee formulated a definition of applied computing, and the initial mission and vision statement for the School, as follows:

Applied Computing. We define “Applied Computing” in the broadest possible sense, encompassing the broad range of fields—from information processing to cyberphysical systems—that contribute to the meaningful advancement and application of computing technology. This includes the design, operation, and implementation of computational technology, regardless of discipline.

Mission. The School of Applied Computing’s mission is to positively transform the application of computing at Cal Poly and beyond. This will be achieved through the continuous and collaborative development of a modern and interdisciplinary curriculum and innovative research initiatives that reflect the values of equity, ethics, and excellence. The School of Applied Computing fosters a collaborative and inclusive community of faculty, staff, and students working together to make a positive, real-world impact and lead the University in its applied computing endeavors.

Vision. We envision the School of Applied Computing becoming a recognized and enduring entity of high quality education and research in the broad disciplines of Applied

---

Footnote 5: Summaries of the data collected are available at: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1cjiNg3h2GobG1haqQmhwhK8WWVNXCpt?usp=sharing
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Computing. We will be a leading and inclusive School that supports a diverse community of faculty, staff, and students, working together to advance the discipline of Computing and its applications, and ensuring their long term professional success and personal growth. We strive to provide all students with the best possible applied computing education, achieved through a modern, equitable, and inclusive curriculum, access to state-of-the-art computing facilities, and through multidisciplinary projects and faculty research, that, in combination, will contribute to their intellectual growth and a conscientious approach to computing.

Structure of the School of Applied Computing

The creation of the SoAC will yield a net gain in resources and opportunities for the member Departments, the College of Engineering, and the University. The following describes the structure of the SoAC in its initial incarnation.

It is important to note, however, that while the creation of the School of Applied Computing will have significant formative impact on Cal Poly, nearly all aspects of the existing Departmental autonomy and College structure will remain unchanged. These include the retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) process, hiring of faculty and lecturers, curricular control, and accreditation.

Director

The SoAC will be led by the Director of the SoAC. The Director is responsible for executing the mission and vision of the SoAC, including evolving the mission and vision of the SoAC as necessary. Other responsibilities include, but not limited to:

- Develop and solely administer the School of Applied Computing budget, including allocation and disbursement of grant and scholarship funds, purchased infrastructure, renovations, and the like.
- Consult with the SoAC Council and member Department Chairs to coordinate funding efforts, including balancing teaching capacity/release time, scholarships, and startup packages.
- Identify new funding mechanisms and establish policies and procedures for funding applications, including overseeing the process and criteria for accepting and evaluating grant proposals and scholarships.
- Define needs for future philanthropic support in partnership with the member Department Chairs and work with the College of Engineering development team to create a plan to address these needs.
- Assist member Departments to expand their computing capacity through new infrastructure, staffing, and industry/government partnerships.
- Manage staff employed by the SoAC.
- Solicit counsel from industry partners through, for example, the formation of an SoAC Industry Advisory Board.
This list is meant to be exemplary, and not exhaustive. As the School evolves and grows, additional or alternative responsibilities for the Director should be considered.

The Director position is envisioned as an MPP-level employee with a renewable five-year term with all expenses compensated through the SoAC endowment. It is expected that the Director will have faculty leadership experience and will have retreat rights to a member Department. The Director serves at the pleasure of the President, Provost, and Dean of the College of Engineering, and is evaluated on a yearly basis. As part of the evaluation process the Dean will consult with the SoAC Council where their assessment of the Director’s performance will be integrated into decisions on continued service.

The SoAC member Department Chairs will continue to report directly to the Dean of the College of Engineering but are envisioned to additionally have a “dotted line” reporting structure to the SoAC Director. The Dean of the College of Engineering will continue to work with the Chairs on all typical Department governance issues. The member Department Chairs will remain full members of the College Council, directly representing their Department’s needs and interests in College-level strategic initiatives. Additionally, the member Department Chairs will report with a “dotted line” to the SoAC Director only on common priorities for all member Departments, which may include topics such as prioritization and disbursement of endowment funds, scholarship awards, joint development opportunities, management of shared space, developing “zoned admissions” or other common academic experiences, planning a joint SoAC “Open House,” and similar activities.

Any SoAC Director will be nominated and hired through a search defined by the SoAC Council. However, if determined advantageous, an Interim Director of the SoAC could be identified by application or by nomination from the faculty of the member Departments and appointed by the Dean of the College of Engineering.

**School of Applied Computing Council**

The School's mission and vision will be executed by the Director, with support and advice from the School of Applied Computing Council. The initial SoAC Council shall consist of:

- Two faculty representatives from each member Department, nominated and appointed by and representing their respective Departments.
- Two affiliate faculty members, initially to be held by two faculty from the Statistics Department.
- Students from the member or affiliate Departments, the number, nomination process, and responsibilities of which will be determined at a later time.

---

6 Here, “dotted line” refers to an informal, but no less important, reporting relationship, allowing Chairs and the Director joint accountability for decisions made by and for the SoAC.

7 The inclusion of a diverse set of student voices on the SoAC Council is extremely important to our students’ experience and belonging within the School. However, we also believe the implementation of the process for nomination, eligibility requirements, term limits, and other procedural issues related to
Alternative Council membership and structure should be considered to meet the evolving needs of the School. For example, as the School, and its affiliate membership grows, the number of external representatives may also grow, and their selection process may change. The SoAC Council shall have responsibilities that primarily include:

- Conducting the search and nomination of the Director of the SoAC.
- Establishing and maintaining the bylaws of the School of Applied Computing.
- Providing support and consultation for the Director of the SoAC in developing and implementing activities consistent with its stated mission and equally representing member departments.
- Reviewing and revising the mission and vision of the SoAC on a five year cycle.

We expect many of the details relating to specific organizational structure and governance of the School of Applied Computing to be codified by the Director, in consultation with the SoAC Council.

Additional Staff
The budget will also include limited funding for a full-time administrator, who will be given duties that align with the mission of the School, and may support collaborative administrative needs and event coordination within the member Departments as appropriate. Such tasks may also include assistance with purchasing, budgeting, and grant administration.

Founding and Member Departments
Member departments of the SoAC will have a strong influence over the directions and practices of the SoAC. In exchange, member departments are expected to provide service to the SoAC. For example, each member Department will have two faculty members serve on the SoAC Council. Other service requirements will be negotiated between the Director of the SoAC and the respective department chairs.

At the time of creation, the School of Applied Computing will have three founding departments: Computer Engineering, Computer Science and Software Engineering, and Electrical Engineering. In the future, it will be possible that additional departments may apply to join the founding departments to become member departments of the SoAC. The mechanism for member application and evaluation will ultimately be determined and implemented by the SoAC Director and Council, but an initial path to affiliation is outlined in Affiliation and Membership below.

Affiliates
Any individual Cal Poly faculty member or programs may become affiliated with the SoAC. Affiliates will be kept aware of the activities of the SoAC and be offered opportunities to participate on the SoAC Council to be beyond the scope of this proposal, and instead should be left to the SoAC Director and the other members of the SoAC Council.
participate with the SoAC. Growing a vibrant and diverse list of affiliate faculty is a key goal of the SoAC. As an example, including the Liberal Arts and Engineering Studies as an affiliate program highlights the interdisciplinary and inclusive mission of the School. Benefits of affiliation may include:

- Help contribute and define the SoAC.
- Inclusion on internal SoAC-wide communications and events.
- Invitation to review faculty grant proposals.
- Invitation to participate in scholarship award processes.

**Affiliation and Membership**

The SoAC Director, in partnership with the SoAC Council, will ultimately define a detailed process for interested faculty, programs, or departments to become Affiliates or Members of the SoAC. However, we expect that expanding the School’s affiliations will be an early and high priority for the SoAC. As such, we provide an initial sample set of requirements that could provide an expedient pathway to affiliation and membership.

The process by which individual faculty seeking Affiliate status within the SoAC shall include the following:

1. Submission of an application containing the following materials:
   a. A proposal documenting the applicant’s relationship to the field of Applied Computing and any previous or potential research, scholarship, and creative activities in the same area.
   b. A letter of support from the applicant’s department Chair or Head and Dean.
2. SoAC Council and Director review application materials and make a determination.

The process by which or programs or departments seeking Membership in the SoAC shall include the following:

1. Submission of an application that:
   a. Provides background on the departmental field, discipline, or subdiscipline that engages in Applied Computing, as broadly defined in the SoAC Mission and Vision.
   b. Identifies and provides evidence of a significant portion of constituent faculty who engage in research, scholarship, and creative activities related to Applied Computing, as broadly defined in the SoAC Mission and Vision.
   c. Documents broad support from the department’s faculty, staff, and/or advisory board members.
   d. Includes a letter of support from the department’s respective Dean and Chair.
2. SoAC Council and Director review application materials and make a determination.
3. Pursue proposal and approvals, as needed and if necessary, within the Academic Senate as per the Office of Academic Programs and Planning policy on academic program reorganization proscribes.

We acknowledge and expect this process to be further codified, expanded, and modified as needed by the Director and SoAC Council.

**Budget and Activities**

The budget of the SoAC will be under the sole oversight of the Director, who will control both the initiatives and allocation of funds from the proceeds of the endowment. Endowment funds will be broadly used in support of the SoAC, but are not intended to be used to support tenure-track faculty lines. Sample opportunities for support include:

- Start-up packages for faculty recruiting.
- Establishing or renewing laboratories and equipment.
- Release time for faculty mentoring student research.
- Release time for new academic program development.
- Faculty and student stipends for summer research.
- Undergraduate student scholarships.
- Graduate student and post-doctoral scholar stipends.
- Sponsoring computing related events, including speaker series, colloquia, and social events.
- Director and administrative position support.

**Space**

Initial space requirements for the creation of the SoAC are minimal. The founding Departments have existing office, teaching, and lab space, which will remain unaffected by the creation of the School. An office for the Director and their staff will be provided by the College of Engineering. As the School grows, in size and in mandate, the School, in coordination with the College of Engineering and the University, will leverage the founding of the school to obtain funds to create space to support burgeoning initiatives.
Appendix A: Response to Executive Committee

We thank the Executive Committee for their thoughtful response to our initial proposal, dated April 22, 2022. We repeat and address the three, overarching concerns identified by the Committee, as follows:

1. If any department shares a program with EE, CSSE, or CPE, the proposal provide documentation these departments were consulted.
2. The results of the ongoing cross-college consultation be completed and documented as part of the proposal package.

We followed the Executive Committee's guidance, and made a fervent effort to dialogue with those departments and faculty most greatly affected by the formation of the SoAC, in particular those that share faculty or degree programs. A timeline and summary of these consultations follows:

4/26/2022: Kevin Lertwachara (Information Systems, OCOB): Professor of Management, HR, and Information Systems
4/26/2022: Statistics Department (COSAM)
4/26/2022: Ashley McDonald (Chemistry, COSAM): Theoretical and Computational Chemistry
4/28/2022: Mathematics Department (COSAM)
5/2/2022: David Gillette (English, CLA): Co-Director, Liberal Arts and Engineering Studies Program
5/5/2022: Jean Davidson (Biological Sciences, COSAM), Paul Anderson (Computer Science, CENG): Representatives for the Bioinformatics Minor.

Nearly all faculty and departments with which we met are strongly supportive of the formation of the School of Applied Computing, and are curious on how to best leverage the School to achieve interdisciplinary research and education goals. As examples, Professor Zambrano showed interest in expanding computing courses for ECON students, as well as team-teaching opportunities within the School. Similar queries were posed when meeting with the Mathematics Department. Professors Gillette and Lovaglio Costello expressed tremendous support for the continued development of the interdisciplinary applied computing programs and projects. Letters of support from Profs. Zambrano and Lovaglio Costello echoing these sentiments are attached.

Of note: while largely supportive, the Statistics Department expressed the most concern, and highlighted how the SoAC, in its current incarnation, could negatively impact their department in
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at least two ways. First, is an expression of frustration with the lack of explicit inclusion of their department in the SoAC, both in conception and in initial consultation, particularly in light of their valuable contributions to the field of applied computing at Cal Poly through Data Science. Second, is the concern that a School of Applied Computing that does not include Statistics, and in particular the Data Science program and affiliated faculty, both confuses and dilutes the “computing” brand at Cal Poly, especially when one considers the carefully cultivated identity of the Statistics Department as a nexus of data science initiatives and expertise, and thus potentially harming the recruitment of faculty, students, and staff (among other unforeseen problems).

The Steering Committee fully acknowledges and empathizes with these frustrations and concerns, particularly in the light of the long, positive, and collaborative history the member departments have (and hope to continue to have) with Statistics. Amendments to this proposal directly addressing these concerns are detailed below.

In addition to the work done by the Steering Committee in direct consultation with faculty and departments, the Dean of the College of Engineering has also been very active in consultation both within the college and with Academic Affairs leadership. Dean Fleischer has had numerous consultations with Department Chairs, other College Deans, her Advisory Council, the Provost, and the President. As evidence of support, we attach to this amended proposal letters of support from all of the College Deans. A detailed schedule of Dean Fliescher’s consultation follows:

1/4/22: Presentation to CENG College Council
1/4/22: CSSE department meeting
1/4/22: EE Department meeting
1/6/22: CPE Department meeting
1/10/22: EE, CPE, CSSE Chairs
1/11/22: CENG College Council
1/21/22: Provost Jackson-Elmoore
1/24/22: CENG College Council
2/15/22: CENG College Council
2/18/22: EE, CPE, CSSE Chairs
3/1/22: Full presentation to CENG College Council
3/3/22: Provost-College Dean’s Council
3/9/22: Dean Wendt
3/14/22: CENG College Council
3/16/22: EE, CPE, CSSE Chairs
3/17/22: CENG all-college faculty/staff meeting
3/17/22: Provost-College Dean’s Council
3/21/22: EE, CPE, CSSE Chairs
3/25/22: Provost Jackson-Elmoore
3/29/22: EE, CPE, CSSE Chairs
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3. Based on the collaborative language in the proposal, the EC feels other departments and affiliate faculty across the university should have a clear pathway to join the SoAC in the future.

Broad inclusion of a diverse set of affiliate faculty from across the University and the support of multidisciplinary efforts are at the heart of the mission and vision of the School of Applied Computing. Indeed, we would consider this effort a failure should it manifest otherwise.

To this end, this proposal has been amended to **make pathways for participation clear and immediate**. The specific changes include incorporating the suggested language provided by the Executive Committee (viz. Section 3.1.1 Executive Committee of the Academic Senate Report: School of Applied Computing). Further, we have added a new section to the Proposal entitled **Affiliation and Membership** that outlines an initial process for affiliation or membership within the SoAC. While a full criteria and process will be codified by the SoAC Director and Council, we believe we provide enough structure to allow for the possibility of immediate affiliation for interested faculty.

Further, to acknowledge the strong, pre-existing relationship the founding member Departments have with the Statistics Department (in particular, in offering the interdisciplinary Data Science minor), we have amended this proposal to initially **assign the two affiliate seats on the SoAC Council to members of the Statistics Department** (as per their own nomination and appointment process). Statistics has always been a valuable and obvious candidate for affiliation with the School. Assigning Statistics both affiliate seats recognizes the importance of the relationship of Statistics to the School, and serves to amplify their voice in shaping the School’s direction and implementation from the onset. This action follows the recommendation of Dean Wendt as per his letter of support, and will help ameliorate some of the concerns identified during our consultation. There are inherent challenges in any reorganization, and growing too fast, too quickly—particularly with cross-College departments and reporting structures—adds significant complexity. Thus, the School is initially proposed as a reorganization under the College of Engineering, with clear and direct reporting lines through the same. As the School grows, a clearer path for future and more direct involvement will be established by the SoAC Council and Director.
Preamble:

As advised by the Chair of the Academic Senate and Provost’s Office, and guided by procedures outlined on the Academic Programs and Planning website (APP1), on April 19, 2022 the Chair of the School of Applied Computing (SoAC) Steering Committee presented a proposal to create a SoAC in the College of Engineering (CENG) to the Executive Committee (EC) of the Academic Senate (AS). As per APP1, “Items” (e.g. 2A, 2B, etc.) refer to specific elements of the reorganization procedure.

Presented with the proposal, the EC is charged with preparing a report and indicating if the EC agrees the proposal is “non-contentious.” If the EC does not agree the proposal is “non-contentious,” and requires more information than Items 2A and 2B, it is to label the proposal “contentious.” As per APP1, these designations determine the pathway to agendizing the proposal to the floor of the Academic Senate (AS).

The EC discussed this matter in closed session on April 19, 2022.

In the proposal, the “affected departments/programs” and “affected faculty” refer to the Electrical Engineering (EE), Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE), and Computer Engineering (CPE) Programs.

Report:

The EC thanks the SoAC Steering Committee and collaborators for the proposal. We acknowledge that considerable work has gone into this process, and we thank all the stakeholders for their thoughtful and substantive efforts.

While the proposal has non-contentious aspects, the EC feels the proposal requires additional information that must be addressed before it is presented to the Academic Senate, so it cannot be formally labeled “non-contentious” according to the language of APP1. In summary, while the proposers consulted extensively within CENG, the proposers did not consult all affected departments, programs, and faculty across the university. As a result, the proposal requires more evidence of transparent cross-college consultation.

In that light, the EC would like to offer two paths forward. The EC advocates for the Flexible Pathway (“A” below, also see the attached flowchart) to allow for additional information gathering while still providing a timely path to the AS floor:

A. Flexible Pathway: If the following information under Proposal Addenda is provided to augment the current proposal, and the EC is satisfied all elements of the request were provided, the proposal can be agendized as a resolution to the AS in First Reading during the Spring of 2022 on the Flexible Timeline outlined below. This augmented proposal would then be included as supplemental material in the resolution as presented to the AS.
B. **Formal Contentious Pathway:** If the Flexible Pathway above is not agreeable, the last Information to EC deadline is missed on the Flexible Timeline, or the augmented proposal is still incomplete as viewed by the EC, the EC must label the proposal “contentious” in a formal sense based on the language of **APP1** and will follow the Formal Contentious Pathway as outlined in Item 4 on **APP1**. The proposers may also choose to select the Formal Contentious Pathway directly by the Information to EC deadline on the Flexible Timeline.

**Proposal Addenda:**

“Items” refer to the elements in **APP1**:

1. **Item 2A:** **APP1** states, “A proposal for the reorganization of an academic program or unit should be preceded by a full and open discussion with faculty members and staff in affected academic programs or units about the proposed changes.” The EC is concerned departments other than EE, CPE, and CSSE fall under the rubric of “affected programs and departments” and may be impacted by this proposed reorganization.

1.1. **If any department shares a program with EE, CSSE, or CPE, the proposal provide documentation these departments were consulted.**

1.1.1. For example, Statistics and CSSE share a program (CDSM Data) and so arguably Statistics should have been consulted as members of the “affected programs/faculty.”

2. **Item 2L:** **APP1** states, “Acknowledgement of the proposal from the relevant dean(s) and relevant Chair(s)/Head(s)/Director(s)”.

2.1. The proposal states: “As we move toward an anticipated resolution by the Academic Senate in Spring 2022, the consultative process will continue particularly with those outside the School and College.”

2.1.1. **The results of the ongoing cross-college consultation be completed and documented as part of the proposal package.**

2.1.1.1. For example, programs on campus such as Information Systems (MHRIS department), the MS in Business Analytics, and Quantitative Economics should have been consulted because of overlapping interests with the SoAC.

3. The proposal states: “In the future, it may be possible that additional departments may apply to join the founding departments to become member departments of the SoAC. The mechanism for member application and evaluation will be determined by the SoAC Director and Council.”

3.1. **Based on the collaborative language in the proposal, the EC feels other departments and affiliate faculty across the university should have a clear pathway to join the SoAC in the future.**

3.1.1. **The EC suggests the proposal use language:** “In the future, it will be possible for additional departments and affiliate faculty across the university to join the founding departments to become members of the SoAC. The mechanism for member application and evaluation will be determined by the SoAC Director and Council.”
**Flexible Timeline (Spring 2022):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information to EC</th>
<th>Earliest Agendized to AS</th>
<th>Earliest AS First Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T April 26</td>
<td>R April 28</td>
<td>T May 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T May 10</td>
<td>R May 12</td>
<td>T May 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T May 17</td>
<td>R May 19</td>
<td>T May 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The trajectory to Second Reading cannot be guaranteed and is based on the parliamentary procedures of the AS and subject to uncertainty. Past practice of the AS dictates if a resolution on the senate floor is not adopted by the final AS meeting of the academic year (May 31, 2022), the resolution will need to be re-agendized by the EC into the AS for the following academic year (AY2022-2023 in the Fall of 2022).

**Reference:**

APP1: [https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/reorganization-academic-programs-and-academic-units-and-suspension-programs](https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/reorganization-academic-programs-and-academic-units-and-suspension-programs)
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Hi Amy:

I fully support the proposal for the School of Applied Computing.

Please let me know your questions.

Respect,

Damon

---

From: Philip J. Williams <pjw@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 22, 2022 2:53 PM
To: Amy Spencer Fleischer <afleisch@calpoly.edu>
Subject: RE: Proposal for Cal Poly School of Applied Computing

Hi Amy,

I support the proposal.

Best,

Philip J. Williams

Dean

College of Liberal Arts

Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA

pronouns he/him/his

Office (805) 756-2706

www.calpoly.edu

cla.calpoly.edu

Twitter: @pjwilliams59
Amy,

Sorry not to get back to you sooner. Yes, I support the formation of a School of Applied Computing within CENG.

Christine

Hi Amy,

I support the proposal with the recommendation that the Statistics Department have an explicit and ongoing position as part of the SoAC Council. It will be important that they participate in discussions of curriculum, particularly as it relates to Data Science at Cal Poly.

Best, dew

Dean E. Wendt
pronouns he/him/his
Dean, College of Science and Mathematics
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
805-756-1619
I support the proposal.

Andy

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

office 805-756-2161
cafes.calpoly.edu
Dear Prof. Peterson,

Thank you for meeting with me regarding the School of Applied Computing (SoAC). In this email, I would love to briefly illustrate the last decade of collaboration between the Art and Design department and the Computer Science department because it shows how much SoAC is needed to support such efforts allowing faculty and students from diverse disciplines across campus to exist and thrive.

In 2011, I began collaborating with computer science (CSC) Prof. Zoë Wood both through classes (her engineering students and my art students building projects together) and professional research (peer-reviewed papers and conferences). While working together, we became committed to creating a formalized joint CSC+Art program with the added goal of breaking gender barriers in a largely male-dominated computer science department (24% female students) and predominantly female-dominated art department (26% male students). After only six years of existence, the Computing for the Interactive Arts minor (CIA is a new format of minors only open for CSC and Art majors) boasts 48% of female participation among the computing majors.

The CIA minor curriculum focuses on creating a collaborative, cross-disciplinary environment in which Art and Design students integrate coding and algorithmic thinking in creative works and Computer Science students apply the principles and methodology of design thinking to visual applications. During a two-quarter-long capstone project, teams of students from mixed educational backgrounds work together to make a final creative, technical project.

Over the years, the computer science department hired Prof. Christian Eckhardt and Prof. April Grow, who joined Zoë and me in teaching the CIA classes. The achievements resulting from our collaboration have been many: Christian, and I have applied and obtained grants together; Zoë and I continue to publish together; our students’ CIA capstone projects were featured in peer-reviewed journals and conferences; our CIA alumni routinely send job opportunities for current CIA students and speak in our classes. While the CIA community has been growing, faculty are now stretched thin, often on the cusp of running out of time and energies to dedicate to CIA.

New hires, such as Jhon Bueno Vesga in CSC, who researches, as I do, the use of virtual reality for pedagogical strategies, for me present new opportunities for joint research that can lead to publications, enrichment inside the classrooms, and prestigious grants. To continue, we need support as we are nearing the point of running out of resources; we need the School of Applied Computing.

I want to express my deep appreciation for your leadership and commitment to creating SoAC. Please do not hesitate to reach out if there is anything I can do to contribute to this effort. SoAc's creation will benefit the entire university, especially in reaching the levels of diversity and inclusion that Cal Poly so desperately needs.

Thank you
Enrica Lovaglio Costello (she, her)
Professor in Digital Media, Art and Design department, Cal Poly
(805) 215 8998
elovaglio@calpoly.edu
On April 26, 2022 Zach Peterson (with John Oliver and Ben Hawkins) presented a proposal for the School of Applied Computing to the Statistics Department. At our next available department meeting (May 3, 2022), the department met to discuss the proposal internally. Andrew Schaffner later debriefed the departmental meeting with Zach Peterson and on Thursday, May 5, met with Amy Fleisher and Zach Peterson to discuss the Statistics Department position on the School.

At the May 3 department meeting, the faculty of the Statistics Department voted to conditionally support the proposal for a School of Applied Computing provided the Statistics Department was an equal departmental member in the School at its inception. We recognized that the provided proposal contains language that allows for broader inclusion in multiple ways: via two affiliate member seats on the SoAC council determined by the Director, and through possible future departmental inclusion using a yet to be determined process. Unfortunately, these pathways to membership that we reviewed provided no guarantee of our participation in the leadership or direct benefits of the school. The affiliate seats may be given to any affiliate faculty across campus and are also subject to selection by a yet unknown Director. Further, for department membership, it is yet to be determined if and how departments outside of CENG could be a member of a School that resides in CENG. Policy on these matters is not clear and requires development on the campus level.

To further support our reasoning for strongly requesting inclusion, we'd like to remind you that Computer Science and Statistics was a single department in the College of Science and Mathematics in the mid 1980's. Finding a shared umbrella to work together now is sensible much in the same way it is used to sensibly rejoin the recently split departments of Computer Science and Computer Engineering. Statistics (and Data Science) has been and continues to be an applied computing discipline. It is essentially impossible to parse, manipulate, visualize, and model data without extensive computing/coding. Computing is pervasive in our curriculum. All our varied methods courses (shown below) are heavily computational with most requiring coding in R, SAS, and for our newer shared DATA courses, Python. Many of these are courses required in the Cross-Disciplinary Studies Minor in Data Science, a program we share with Computer Science. Many of these courses are included in an interdisciplinary BS in Data Science proposal (under development) to be proposed jointly by faculty in mathematics, statistics, and computer science. Should the Statistics Department be excluded from the school, we would object to the name “School of Applied Computing” as it does not represent all of the applied computing departments represented on campus. In that case we would suggest a more narrow name that better reflects the participating departments.

- STAT 305: Introduction to Probability and Simulation
- STAT 323: Design of Experiments I
- STAT 324: Applied Regression Analysis
- STAT 334: Applied Linear Models

- STAT 330: Statistical Computing with SAS
- STAT 331: Statistical Computing with R
- STAT 405: Applied Probability Models
- STAT 414: Multilevel and Mixed Modeling
To address the department’s concerns regarding inclusion, Dean Fleisher has offered the two affiliate seats on the Council to the Statistics Department at inception. As noted above, these seats do not constitute full membership for our department nor permanent seats on the Council, but we do appreciate the inclusion and the ability to more directly support the mission and values of the School as well as share in its benefits. We also look forward to continuing our collegial relations with Computer Science. Our faculty enjoy teaching a shared curriculum, jointly presenting at conferences, and even administratively working together to ensure mutual scheduling of courses and providing seats to our partners to ensure timely degree progress in our majors and our joint CDSM minor.

We look forward to more formal inclusion in the future and hope that permanent seats for full department inclusion will be possible. A School of Applied Computing without Statistics Department membership may be damaging to our department and programs. The proposal makes note of the value of “Brand, Identity, and Collaboration.” We recognize this as well. If we were to be excluded, it may send wrong signals to prospective students, faculty, and staff. Our exclusion might imply that we are a theoretical program or that we do not engage in statistical computing and data science. Not being part of the brand would not only deny us the advantages of the brand but may actually cast a shadow on our department and programs. We appreciate Dean Fleischer’s recognition of this ongoing partnership, responsiveness to our concerns, and gestures towards greater inclusion.
FYI – nice work.
Amy

Amy S. Fleischer, PhD (She/her/hers)
Dean, College of Engineering
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA
805 756-2131
Instagram: dramyfleischer
Twitter: @amyfleischer
LinkedIn: Amy Fleischer

Cal Poly is in tilhini, the Place of the Full Moon. We gratefully acknowledge, respect, and thank yak titu titu yak tilhini, Northern Chumash Tribe of San Luis Obispo County and Region, in whose homelands we are guests.

From: Andrew A. Schaffner <aschaffn@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2022 8:54 AM
To: Thomas D. Gutierrez <tdgutier@calpoly.edu>
Cc: Sarah Best <sbest@calpoly.edu>; Dean E. Wendt <dwendt@calpoly.edu>; Amy Spencer Fleischer <afleisch@calpoly.edu>
Subject: Re: STAT memo for SoAC

Hi Tom,

I wanted to note that I wrote the memo before seeing the revised proposal, which I've just now seen. I appreciate Amy's responsiveness and the thoroughness of Zach, Ben, and John on the proposal revisions. While slowing things down was inconvenient, I do believe the proposal is stronger.

Andrew

Andrew Schaffner
Pronouns he/him/his
Chair and Professor, Statistics Department
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo CA
phone: 805-756-1545
e-mail: aschaffn@calpoly.edu
zoom: https://calpoly.zoom.us/my/aschaffn (ID: 805 756 1545)
schedule meeting: https://calendly.com/aschaffn

From: Thomas D. Gutierrez <tdgutier@calpoly.edu>
Hi John & Zachary,

I’m writing to express my support of the SoAC initiative. Increasing access and learning opportunities for students is a wonderful idea. I am interested in participating in this initiative and collaborating with the SoAC faculty in the future.

Best,
Kevin

From: John Y. Oliver <jyoliver@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Monday, May 9, 2022 9:39 AM
To: Kevin Lertwachara <klertwac@calpoly.edu>
Cc: Zachary N.J. Peterson <znjp@calpoly.edu>
Subject: RE: School of Applied Computing

Hi Kevin,

Think you could write a 1-2 sentence letter of support for the creation of the SoAC? If you could please send a copy to Dr. Peterson (attached). Thanks.

From: John Y. Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2022 9:43 AM
To: Kevin Lertwachara <klertwac@calpoly.edu>
Subject: School of Applied Computing

Sorry, forgot to send this info to you.

Slides

Attached proposal draft.

---

John Oliver (he/him), Professor
Computer Engineering
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo
jyoliver@calpoly.edu
https://calpoly.zoom.us/j/80576565434
html: www.ee.calpoly.edu/faculty/jyoliver
achiever|consistency|responseibility|analytical|strategic
To Whom It May Concern

We write in our capacities as Area Chair of the Economics Area and Program Director of the MS in Quantitative Economics at Cal Poly.

We have had the opportunity to discuss and review the proposal for the creation of the School of Applied Computing. We believe this to be a remarkable idea that should benefit the students of every College on campus and we strongly support the initiative. In particular, we in the Economics Area also look forward to our students increasing their breadth and depth of training in Applied Computing, as this is an essential skill for professional and academic economists to have and master. At the same time, we also look forward to contributing to the success of the School of Applied Computing with our own teaching and research efforts in this field of knowledge.

Sincerely,

Arie Shafran
Chair of the Economics Area, Orfalea College of Business

Eduardo Zambrano
Program Director of the MS in Quantitative Economics at Cal Poly
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RESOLUTION ON TIMELY ADOPTION OF COURSEWARE IN SUPPORT OF AFFORDABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

Impact on Existing Policy: Formalizes change in deadline for ordering course materials.

WHEREAS, Academic Senate Resolution AS-654-07 specifies deadlines for ordering course materials; and

WHEREAS, AS-654-07 specifies that departments are required to inform the university bookstore of textbook and coursepack selections for all courses requiring textbooks or coursepacks at least six weeks prior to the start of the academic term; and

WHEREAS, In 2008, the Higher Education Opportunities Act (HEOA) was signed into federal law; and

WHEREAS, The text of the HEOA states: “To the maximum extent practicable, each institution of higher education receiving federal financial assistance shall....Disclose, on the institution’s internet course schedule and in a manner of the institution’s choosing, the ISBN (International Standard Book Number) and retail price information of required and recommended [course materials] for each course listed in the institution’s course schedule used for preregistration and registration purposes.”; and

WHEREAS, The CSU Chancellor’s Office has restated the expectation that “Campuses are to provide students access to course material information and costs associated with the schedule of classes for each term, no later than the first date of registration. These requirements are, as noted in the HEOA, ‘To ensure that students have access to affordable course materials by decreasing costs to students and enhancing transparency and disclosure with respect to the selection, purchase, sale, and use of course materials.’”; and
WHEREAS, Complying with the HEOA requirements is a condition for the CSU receiving student financial aid from the Federal government; and

WHEREAS, Complying with the HEOA contributes to Cal Poly’s commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion; therefore be it

RESOLVED: Deadlines for ordering course materials shall comply with the HEOA, which supersedes the language of AS-654-07; and

RESOLVED: That by January 15 each year the Registrar’s Office should notify all faculty and the university bookstore of the course material adoption deadlines for all terms of the approaching academic year, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the provost or designee will compile, each term, a report detailing that term’s timely adoption rates by each department and send that report to all college deans, department chairs, and department heads.

Proposed by the Academic Senate Instruction Committee
Date: April 14, 2022