I. Minutes: January 12, 2021 (pp. 3-4)

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

A. HIST 254R and AGC 145 were pulled from the 2/9/21 consent agenda and will be placed as discussion items on the next available Senate agenda as part of the appeals hearing process with the Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee. They are tentatively scheduled to be on the 3/9/21 agenda.

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office: (pp. 5-6)
C. Provost: (p. 7)
D. Vice President for Student Affairs: (p. 8)
E. Statewide Senate: (pp. 9-11)
F. CFA: (p. 12)
G. ASI: (p. 13)

IV. Special Reports:

A. GWR Advisory Board Update: Dawn Janke, Chair, GWR Advisory Board

V. Consent Agenda:

A. University Faculty Personnel Policies Appendix: Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students: (pp. 14–17)
B. ASSC SUSCAT Courses for 2020-2021: (pp. 18-20)
C. 2021-2022 Catalog Review Consent Agenda Item: (pp. 21-22)
D. 

---

### ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ACADEMIC SENATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC 222 Classical Social Theory (4), 4 lectures</td>
<td>Reviewed and recommended for approval 1/7/21.</td>
<td>On the 2/9/21 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. **Business Items:**
A. **Resolution on “Poly Access” Textbook Program:** Ryan Jenkins, Philosophy Department and John Hagen, chair, Academic Senate Instruction Committee, first reading (pp. 23-26)
B. **Resolution to Set Cal Poly’s Carbon Neutrality Target Date:** David Braun, Academic Senate Sustainability Committee Chair, first reading (pp. 27-28)
C. **Resolution to Establish Area F in the General Education 2020 Template:** Gary Laver, Chair, General Education Governance Board, first reading (pp. 29-31)
D. **Resolution on Subject Area Guidelines for General Education Area F: Ethnic Studies:** Jose Navarro, Ethnic Studies Requirement Curriculum Sub Committee, first reading (pp. 32-35)
E. **Resolution on Updating the United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) Education Objectives:** Grace Yeh, Chair, Academic Senate UCSP Review Committee, first reading (pp. 36-40)
F. **Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 12.4: Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves:** Ken Brown, Chair, Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 41-48)
G. **Resolution on New Academic Assessment Council Membership:** Michael Nguyen, Academic Assessment Council, first reading (pp. 49-51)

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

VIII. **Adjournment:**
Meeting of the Academic Senate Minutes  
Tuesday, January 12, 2021

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the November 10, 2020 and November 17, 2020 Academic Senate minutes.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): No announcements.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: None.
B. Provost: Provost Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore reported on the academic plans for upcoming quarters. Summer 2021 is going to be largely virtual with the same number of courses offered last summer. Provost Jackson-Elmoore also urged the Senate to begin planning a majority in-person Fall 2021 with the consideration of on-going vaccination programs, and vulnerable populations. She also reminded the Senate that curricular review is not required for courses that are being taught virtually due as a result of COVID-19.
C. Statewide Senate: Gary Laver reported on the newly released budget and is cautiously optimistic about funding for the next year. He also reported on the special meetings to discuss the degree transfer requirements in light of the new GE Area F.
D. CFA: Lewis Call updated the Senate on a letter from faculty that voiced concerns and opposition to Cal Poly’s plan to bring students on campus. The letter called for three things: suspending in-person classes and switching to an all-virtual mode of instruction, de-densifying the dorms, and guaranteeing twice-a-week testing. The letter has been signed by 300 faculty members.
E. ASI: ASI President Shayna Lynch reported on ASI’s effort on getting all ASI members scholarships, and the passage of a resolution that requires a diversity statement in ASI bylaws. She also voiced students’ frustrations with the Duo-multi factor authentication and being unable to return to work due to a positive COVID test, despite no longer being infectious.

IV. Special Reports:
A. University Update: President Armstrong reported on the progress of student move in. There has been an increase in students living on campus from last quarter. Cal Poly is making progress on moving towards in-house saliva testing that President Armstrong anticipates will be ready by the end of the month. Currently, the University, with the partnership with Avellino Testing, is able to process 24k tests a week. The University is also establishing a COVID Help Center that would employ students who have been unable to work. Cal Poly has a representative on the SLO County COVID Task Force who is working on establishing Cal Poly has a center of distribution. President Armstrong also reported that the applicants for the class of 2025 were part of the most diverse pool ever.
B. Inclusive Excellence Update: Dr. Denise Isom, Interim Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer gave a slide presentation on the goals for the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. This report can be found here: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/Senate OUDI Agenda %26 update.pdf

V. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Pilot Pathways Program within General Education: Gary Laver, Chair, General Education Governance Board reminded the Senate of the program’s goals of linking courses together within GE exploratory groups. The Pilot Pathways Program working group created a framework for the pilot to test one such pathway in GE courses. This proposed pilot would be a year or two-year exploration within the GE, including a set floor and
ceiling for units. There is no budget currently involved. This resolution will return to the Senate in first reading status at the next Academic Senate meeting.

B. Resolution on “Poly Access” Textbook Program: Ryan Jenkins reminded the Senate that this resolution is to change the “Poly Access” program to being opt-in, rather than opt-out. Vice Chair Greenwood yielded her time to Andrea Burns, a representative of Cal Poly Corporation. She informed the Senate that this program is exclusively opt-in and yields $200k in savings. Senator John Hagen reported that the Instruction Committee discussed this program and support the resolution because they disagree with students being charged for inaction. This resolution will return to the Senate in first reading status at the next Academic Senate meeting.

C. Resolution to Set Cal Poly’s Carbon Neutrality Target Date: This resolution will return to the Senate in first reading status at the next Academic Senate meeting.

VI. Discussion Item(s): None.

VII. Adjournment: 5:00

Submitted by,

Amelia Solis Macias

Amelia Solis Macias

Academic Senate Student Assistant
I. COVID – Campus Update

A. Up-to-date testing numbers can be found on the COVID Dashboard; https://coronavirus.calpoly.edu/dashboard

A breakdown of recent testing is outlined below (Testing as of Tuesday 2/2):

Total asymptomatic tests resulted:
- 42,582 asymptomatic results processed (CHW and Avellino)
- 170 total (CHW and Avellino) asymptomatic positive results, or 0.39%

Total symptomatic resulted:
- 2242 symptomatic test results returned by CH&W
- 202 symptomatic positives, or 9%

Total tests resulted:
- 44,824 tests resulted as of 2/1/2021
- 376 positives (fac/staff/students) since 1/3/2021
- 0.83%
  - 43,266 total tests collected* through Avellino
  - 2215 asymptomatic collected by CHW
  - 2242 symptomatic collected by CHW
  - 47,723 tests collected since 1/3/2021

*note, resulted differs from collected
Since we ship to Avellino and have specimens in transit, there is a lag between what has been collected and what has been resulted.

B. Saliva Pilot Program – Update. We will be transitioning away from swab testing done by a third party – Avellino – later in the month; and will be handling all testing of students, faculty, and staff in our on-campus saliva testing lab. The Saliva Testing Program is currently in its pilot phase – running samples to test the process and logistics, etc., but not sharing the results with the participants. If all goes as planned, the lab will be fully functional beginning the week of February 18; and full testing will begin.

II. CSU Budget Advocacy Week – Virtual this year. Normally, each year, President Armstrong would travel to Sacramento to advocate for Cal Poly, the CSU and higher education. Last week, he headed a delegation from Cal Poly in conversations with Fiona Ma, California State Treasurer; and participated in conversations with Chancellor Castro, representatives from the CSU and State Senator John Laird and Assemblyman Jordan Cunningham. Overall Cal Poly’s State representatives are generally supportive of CSU’s and the University’s mission and goals.

CSU’s budget priorities are the following:

- Add $365 million to the CSU budget to fully fund the Graduation Initiative 2025 request and fully restore prior cuts to ensure the System can do the most it can to contribute to the resiliency of the state’s economy and our students’ futures.
• Add an additional $565 million in one-time dollars to fund academic facilities and renewal needs.

III. Renee Reijo Pera, Vice President of Research, Economic Development and Graduate Education, will be leaving Cal Poly, effective April 5, 2021, to return to Montana and lead a private, non-profit institute there. We thank Dr. Pera for her exceptional service, in particular championing the Strategic Research Initiatives, further developing and streamlining the structure and function of the research administration enterprise, and raising the visibility of the research, scholarship and creative activities here at Cal Poly.

We expect the programs Dr. Pera has focused on will remain priorities under new leadership. We, of course, wish her well in her future pursuits and know that she is seeking ways to continue to remain affiliated with Cal Poly.

We anticipate identifying interim leadership in the very near future and look forward to continuing this important work.

IV. Concern about Burmese Students. The President has reached out to our Burmese students facing a very difficult time; whether at home in Myanmar or here in the U.S. worried about family in Burma. The International Center has reached out to the colleges and departments and advised them of the situation. We are aware that the internet may not be reliable and that this can make it challenging to complete coursework and communicate with campus. The staff at the Center remain available to assist in finding resources needed from campus, whether they be personal or academic.
Outdoor Labs / Fieldwork

Academic Affairs leadership is working through an exception process for the case-by-case consideration of a limited number of field trips specifically associated with outdoor labs/fieldwork linked to specific in-person classes. The intent is to provide some limited opportunities for students to benefit from these hands-on, Learn by Doing experiences deemed as a key component of the curriculum and provide for their health and safety, and the health and safety of our instructors. Specific processes are being created to ensure the development of safety plans that address COVID-19 prevention as well as non-COVID-19 risk factors. All requests must be approved by the college dean, reviewed by Environmental Health & Safety (EHS), and the Emergency Operations Center (EOC), and finally, approved by the provost. Academic Programs and Planning (APP), EHS, and EOC are all working closely together on this so our processes for preparing for, reviewing, and approving outdoor labs/fieldwork is robust and clearly communicated. Once these processes are final, they will be appropriately communicated across the division.

Wang Award Recipient

Aydin Nazmi was recently honored as one of four faculty members across the CSU system to receive the Wang Family Excellence Award for Outstanding Faculty Service. Many of you likely know Aydin from his work with the Basic Needs Initiative, his leadership to our campus and Central Coast communities throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, and his work as a professor in the Food Science and Nutrition Department. In his role as a Faculty Fellow for COVID-19 Response and Preparedness, Aydin has been a crucial voice on how to safely house students on campus; how to safely offer in-person courses; how to educate and test thousands of students living off-campus in the San Luis Obispo area; and how to expand both campus testing and surveillance capacity using faculty expertise and on-campus resources. This is the fourth year in a row that a Cal Poly faculty member has received the Wang Award for their outstanding work and service. Congratulations to Aydin on this well-deserved honor!

Panetta Institute Congressional Internship

In January, the Office of Provost launched the call for applications for the 2021 Panetta Institute Congressional Internship. This opportunity is open to students from all majors and provides an opportunity for students to enhance their educational experience by providing real-world engagement in the exploration of Congress, civil leadership, and community and public service. The selected student will spend two weeks in training at the Panetta Institute at CSU Monterey Bay followed by 11 weeks in Washington D.C. serving in the office of a California Congressperson. The cost of the program is fully funded in order to allow participation by any qualified student, independent of family income. The application process closed on February 3. Following a comprehensive interview process, the Office of the Provost looks forward to announcing President Armstrong's decision on the selected student later this quarter.
Student Affairs
Report to Academic Senate
January 27, 2021 (for 2/9/2021 meeting)

- The priority sign-up window for 2021-22 on campus housing opened on February 2 for continuing students who are required to live on campus for their first two years. These are student-athletes, Cal Poly Scholars, and students in CAED and CAFES. Thank you for your help in reminding students to take this step.
- Through occupancy management, the university has been able to increase COVID-19 isolation spaces in the housing footprint to 295.
- Campus Health and Wellbeing is leading a campus-wide vaccination task force to look at all aspects of COVID-19 vaccination, with the goal of being ready for mass distribution to our community when vaccination supply allows for greater distribution.
- Vice President Humphrey has been appointed to the CSU system-wide Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee as the Student Affairs representative. As the immediate Past-Chair of the system-wide Student Affairs Council, he will serve on SPBAC for two years.
- All Student Affairs offices remain open with a staff member maintaining a physical presence on campus for students who need support. The majority of services remain virtual.
ASCU Meeting Notes – 2021 01 – To be edited for Report to Cal Poly Academic Senate

ASCU Chair Collins Report:

- highlights include: discussion of progress on ES with CSUCES and the CO.
- LAO: people in Sacramento have noticed LAO’s report included considerable input from the ASCSU and was valued
- CSSA: Robust Advocacy efforts from our Students in Sacramento
- The budget is looking better than what we were thinking it would look like in September

Standing Committees

- FGA: The budget increase isn’t quite as rosy as it seems as it includes money for CalPERS contributions, etc.

Other Committees

- **GEAC:** The January 2021 GEAC meeting was dominated by two major topics: (1) further work on Ethnic Studies: Area F evaluation processes as well as a discussion about how UC BOARS and CSU GEAC may work together to include ethnic studies into IGETC. (2) Credit for Prior Learning (revision to EO 1036)—AP credit, military credit, CLEP, credit from industry, etc.; [Systemwide Admission Eligibility and/or Baccalaureate Credit Awarded for External Examinations, Experiential Learning, and Instruction in Non-Collegiate Settings]. In addition to Ethnic Studies and Credit for Prior Learning, other content touched on in the meeting included access and equity concerns vis-à-vis student success, the desirability of credit/no credit grading during COVID, the call for Articulation Officers to identify areas that could use further clarity based on their experiences with the IGETC Standards 2.0 document, a request from Cal Maritime for two of their high unit degree programs to receive an Oral Communication waiver, and an initial discussion of a math council request for further clarity in the CSU GE Guiding Notes for Area B4 (the inclusion of the Math Council “principles and guidelines” content)

CFA: CFA President Charles Toombs reported that the union met with CSU management week. Repopulation of campuses was discussed … meet-n-confer was last week. CFA has requested immediate restoration of CPAL (Covid Paid Administrative Leave) which has lapsed. (The ASCSU’s Faculty Affairs committee will introduce a resolution on this topic.) Although they have announced their intention to return to normal operations next year, the CSU didn’t really have their ducks in a row with planning for face-to-face instruction in the fall. CFA presented plans related to the health and safety of faculty, staff and students, and they will meet with the CSU again on this topic. Bargaining: contract extended thru June 30, 2021. Proposals from CFA put forward and CSU hasn’t responded yet. See website for details of negotiations. Not bargaining on salary (yet) but if no deal by June 30, that will change. The CFA is leery of the intention tied to the Governor’s proposed budget to increase virtual teaching by ten percent. The union is also hoping that the one-minute limit on public comment to
the Board of Trustees can be modified. (The ASCSU’s Faculty Affairs committee will introduce a resolution on this topic.)

**Faculty Trustee Sabalius:** Budget comments... All told, the CSU may receive about $1.2 billion in the coming year based on the Governor’s proposed budget and the federal stimulus package (assuming the State doesn’t cut the CSU budget accordingly). $237M budget request was advocated by Gov during Sep BOT meeting. Requested $550M in Nov meeting. Jan budget proposal: $369 increase (see comments from Mark and Jerry). $175M is earmarked for deferred maintenance (although the system’s need is close to three times this amount). Among the expectations tied to the Governor’s proposal is that on-line teaching be increased and that tuition not be raised. CSU should get $840M from Feds, >33% to student assistance. Furloughs almost certainly a non-issue. No new ES development. Auxiliary (housing/dining/parking) needs due to losses may be covered. (Note: auxiliaries cannot be given but only loaned money.)

**Faculty Trustee Recommending Committee:** Committee chair Nelson reported that the committee reviewed campus nominations for Faculty Trustee Nominee (for the CSU Board of Trustees) and selected finalists to be interviewed by the ASCSU in March. Once the interviews are complete, the ASCSU in Executive Session votes on which nominees to send forward to the Governor. A minimum of two nominees must be sent to the Governor. At its January 19 meeting, the committee chose the following CSU faculty as finalists:

- Professor Edward Fink, CSU Fullerton
- Professor Tasha Howe, CSU Humboldt
- Professor Katia Karadjova, CSU Humboldt
- Professor Theresa Montaño, CSU Northridge
- Professor Romey Sabalius, San Jose State University
- Professor Darlene Yee-Melichar, San Francisco State University
- Professor Rika Yoshii, CSU San Marcos

**CSU-ERFSA:** has been able to maintain relatively stable membership and funds despite COVID. In the last cycle, they were able to award $6,000 in grants to faculty for equipment and research projects.

**EVC Blanchard:** He will be leaving the CSU to take a position as President of the University of Houston—Downtown. He mentioned the following as current system priorities: (1) Streamlining the application process between the community colleges and the CSU; (2) Following the decision of the UC, the CSU has also placed a moratorium on using the SAT for admissions decisions. This will last through the 2022–2023 academic year, so an examination of this as an ongoing policy is occurring. (3) Academic honesty policies across the campuses in the system are quite variable. Efforts will be made at some standardization. (4) The CSU overall has experienced declines in number of students as well as in unit load taken from the fall into the spring semester. (5) Campus presidents will be rolling out repopulation plans for the fall 2021 term.
Chancellor Castro: Introductory remarks boilerplate. “Hopes” that the majority of classes can be offered face-to-face in Fall but that depends on vaccinations and local public health assessments. “Cautiously optimistic” about the budget because of blue control at fed and state levels. Hopes the May budget revise will be continuing the swing towards a better budget. Sen McCarty’s bill for additional funding for student mental health. Castro met with Biden team recently seeking additional one-time funding ($600M) [in addition to … or as part of …?]. Biden’s team wants to increase PELL caps and get DACA students allowed for PELL. Vaccine plans in DC are changing so the Chancellor wants to see what happens there before we know whether campuses will be handling vaccine for faculty, staff and students. Question on Mathematics Preparation for admission and support of STEM classes for students who are, on average, not well prepared. [Personal side-note: this is a very challenging issue for lots of us.].
CFA Report for Academic Senate Meeting February 9, 2021

The CSU has announced plans to resume face-to-face instruction in Fall 2021. The Chancellor's Office did not notice CFA of this proposed change in faculty working conditions, as required by our Collective Bargaining Agreement. CFA immediately demanded to Meet and Confer with the CO on this important matter.

In their meeting with management, CFA statewide leaders reviewed the impact of repopulating CSU campuses on faculty and student health and safety, and began a dialogue that will hopefully inform the next steps in planning. CFA has informed the CSU that faculty expect certain health and safety benchmarks to be firmly in place before returning to work on the campuses. Faculty need to be assured that vaccines have been made available to everyone in our campus communities. There must be clarity on prevention and outbreak protocols. Presently, there is unevenness across the campuses and a lack of direction and guidance from the CSU.

CFA SLO recently surveyed faculty regarding their views on COVID-19 vaccinations. Over 440 Cal Poly faculty participated in the survey. Only 2.3% of respondents had already been vaccinated. 89.4% of those who had not yet been vaccinated plan to get vaccinated as soon as they qualify.

Many faculty are justifiably concerned about working conditions in the upcoming 2021-22 academic year. Our survey included a question about teaching modality for next year. About 200 faculty responded to that question; of those, over 90% said that they thought they may need to teach virtually next year. The most frequently cited reasons include: because they are high-risk for COVID themselves, because they have family members who are high-risk, because the vaccines are not 100% effective, and because the vaccines may be ineffective against the new variants of the virus. Many faculty said that they would have to teach virtually if their kids' schools or daycare facilities were still closed, if the faculty members themselves had not been vaccinated, or if all of their students had not been vaccinated. Some faculty said that although they did not need to teach virtually, they wanted to do so in order to promote public health by reducing population density on campus.

CFA is trying to bargain an extension of the CSU's COVID-19 Paid Administrative Leave (CPAL) program. Despite CFA's best efforts to educate the Chancellor's Office about the continued need for this important leave program, the CO is currently unwilling to extend the program. CFA is calling on CSU faculty to join the fight for extended CPAL leave. Faculty who want to participate in this important faculty rights campaign are encouraged to fill out this form with their contact information and any ideas that have about how to get the CO to change their position: https://www.calfac.org/post/demanding-continuation-covid-19-leave (This information is for internal CFA use only.)

Faculty are also encouraged to email CSU Chancellor Joseph Castro at jcastro@calstate.edu to call on him to extend the CPAL program. Faculty can use this email template, and are encouraged to add their personal stories.

Chancellor Castro,

As a faculty member at the California State University, I am calling on you to commit to an extension of the COVID-19 Paid Administrative Leave (CPAL) or similar leave program. Cases and hospitalizations continue to increase across our communities, and the lack of leadership from you and CSU management in regard to COVID-19 leave protection for myself and my colleagues is alarming. Even though Cal Poly's Winter Quarter has already begun, there is still time for you to offer real relief to faculty who need it. We call on you to implement another leave program and demonstrate bold leadership through this difficult time.

When you implement a new leave program, please ensure that instructional faculty can take a partial leave or workload reduction while their children's schools and daycare facilities are closed due to the pandemic.
ASI Report for Academic Senate Meeting 2-9-21

General Updates:
- ASI’s Executive Director, Marcy Maloney, has announced her retirement after 31 years working to serve students in ASI. We are all very sad to see her go, but grateful for the tremendous impact she has made on our organization. We are currently working with the VP for Student Affairs in a search process for our interim executive director who will begin around the first week of March in order to be trained by Marcy before her departure.

From the Board:
- The ASI Board of Directors will meet on February 3rd where we will be voting on:
  - Approving the 2021-22 ASI Candidate Packets for President and Board elections
  - Approving a proposal to allocate $5,625 of remaining ASI Club Funding to Club Sports for the 2020-21 FY
  - Approval of the proposal to recommend the reallocation of $35,000 of ASI Club Funding to Cal Poly Cares for the 2020-21 FY
    - This proposal comes from a recommendation from the ASI Officers who saw that ASI Club Funding was not being spent this year since clubs cannot hold events in-person. Seeing the major need to address basic needs (technology included in this), the ASI Officers proposed reallocating $35,000 to Cal Poly Cares.

University Union Advisory Board Update:
- Under the direction of the UUAB, the Pride Crosswalk on Mustang Way has been repainted to remain vibrant. The UUAB is currently reviewing ongoing maintenance plans and will vote to endorse a long-term plan to keep the crosswalk well maintained soon.

Executive Cabinet:
- Secretary of D&I, Jasmine Till, put together an Instagram spotlight campaign to highlight students and faculty members that are fighting for racial justice who are often under appreciated. This campaign went on the ASI Instagram and included photos and quotes from these individuals. Please check out the ASI Instagram if you’re interested.
- Secretary of Community Relations, Caty Ogden, has put together a video with a variety of different students that showcases why each of them wears a mask. This is up on the ASI social media, so please check it out.

Cal State Student Association (CSSA):
- CSSA’s next plenary is the weekend of February 13-14. We will keep you all updated of anything that passes through that meeting.
University Faculty Personnel Policies  
Consent Agenda Proposal

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 Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. It also allows the Senate Executive Committee to place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda.

Summary of Chapter 12.3: Assigned Time for Exceptional Service to Students

The Collective Bargaining Agreement establishes a program of awarding assigned time to faculty who have performed exceptional levels of service to students that has not otherwise been compensated. The Faculty Affairs Committee drafted policies and criteria for assigning these awards. These policies had been circulated annually when announcing the awards and soliciting faculty participation in the awards committee. These policies should reside in UFPP.

Impact on Existing Policy

This action moves existing policy into UFPP, with one addition that reflects the practices of the past two implementations of this program. That revision is highlighted in red underlined text and states that the Academic Senate chair may assign the functions of the committee that evaluates the request for these awards to a standing Senate committee.

Implementation

None.

Consultation with Faculty Units about UFPP

Unnecessary.

What follows is the proposed policy text ...

Faculty Affairs Committee, Fall 2020
12.3. Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students

12.3.1. PURPOSE: To provide a process for all Unit 3 faculty to write proposals and compete for assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students that supports the priorities of the California State University (CSU) system and support California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly’s) Mission and Strategic Plan pursuant to Article 20, Section 37 of the 2014—2017 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between CSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the extension of the CBA through 2019 – 2020.

12.3.2. EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT SERVICE COMMITTEE (ESSC)

12.3.2.1. Each academic college shall be a constituency and shall have a representative on the Exceptional Student Service Committee (ESSC). The Academic Senate Chair may assign the functions of the ESSC to a standing Academic Senate committee.

12.3.2.2. One faculty member from each constituency defined above shall be appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, and a student will be appointed by the Associated Students, Inc. The Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs or his/her designee will serve as a nonvoting ex-officio member. Each appointed member shall serve a one-year term. Faculty serving on this committee shall not be applicants for assigned time.

12.3.2.3. The functions of ESCC shall be:

• Evaluate faculty applications for assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students.
• Make recommendations based on those evaluations to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.
• Periodically review and, if needed, make recommendations for changes in this policy to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).

12.3.3. ASSIGNED TIME BUDGET AND REPORTING

12.3.3.1. There is no CSU allocation provided to support assigned time. Campuses are required to self-fund the assigned time allocations based on the number of full-time equivalent students at each campus. At Cal Poly, the assigned time will be funded by the Provost.

12.3.3.2. Cal Poly shall expend all assigned time allocated under this program. Cal Poly shall provide an accounting of assigned time expended for this program for the prior fiscal year by no later than November 1 of the subsequent year to the ESSC, the FAC, the Academic Senate, Campus CFA President, and the CSU.

12.3.3.3. All assigned time allocations must be expended in the academic year per restrictions specified below. For accounting purposes, costs of assigned time shall be calculated based on the minimum salary for an assistant professor. Awards from appeals shall not exceed 10% of the annual budget for assigned time and shall be funded in the subsequent academic year. During the last year of the agreement, appeals must be funded from the funds for that year, including any rollover from previous years.

12.3.4. ELIGIBILITY & RESTRICTIONS

12.3.4.1. All Unit 3 faculty employees are eligible to submit a proposal to request assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students. Faculty who have previously received assigned time under this program will be eligible to apply for another assigned time award. Faculty members already receiving other sources of assigned time or compensation for the same general category of activity (e.g. assigned time for excess enrollments, assigned time for committee service) shall not be eligible for support from this program.
12.3.4.2. Assigned time can only be utilized during the academic year (September – June) during which the activity is performed.

12.3.5. TIMELINE
12.3.5.1. Application for assigned time shall be for activities in the subsequent academic year. A timeline for applications shall be announced in the notification sent to faculty upon the opening of the application period. Typically the call for applications occurs in Fall quarter with applications due to the applicant’s department chair/head around the beginning of Winter quarter, though contingencies may delay the notification period.

12.3.5.2. The applicant’s department chair/head submits the application materials to the applicant’s Dean, who then submits the applications to the ESSC typically by early in Winter quarter. The ESSC reviews applications and submits its recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in time for applicants to be notified of the status of their applications near the end of Winter quarter.

12.3.6. APPLICATION MATERIALS AND CRITERIA
12.3.6.1. The distribution of application materials concerning assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students should target department chairs/heads, program directors and students to encourage applications from faculty they view as having taken on extraordinary burdens in the related categories of service to students.

12.3.6.2. An application for assigned time to support exceptional levels of service to students shall consist of:
   • A completed proposal that includes sufficiently detailed narrative, not to exceed two pages, on the template provided for this purpose, which includes sufficient justification for the use of assigned time requested, the impact factor (see application), a description of how the service is extraordinary, and how the WTUs requested correlate to work effort;
   • The faculty applicant’s current curriculum vitae (CV), with relevant service activities for which assigned time is being sought highlighted;
   • A statement from the department chair indicating support for the proposal and verification that no other source of assigned time or compensation has been provided for the same general activity; and
   • The college dean’s recommendation.

12.3.6.3. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.

12.3.7. SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES AND REVIEW CRITERIA
12.3.7.1. The following activities may be supported:
   • Student mentoring, advising, and outreach that goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of all faculty;
   • Activities that support underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students;
   • Curricular redesign intended to improve student access and success;
   • Service to the department, college, university, or community that goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of all faculty;
   • Other extraordinary forms of service to students.

12.3.7.2. Review criteria:
   • Narrative description of proposed activity/project detailing nature of service provided;
• Demonstration of how the service to the students is extraordinary – provide context of the full service and teaching load such that this service to students is extraordinary in light of the totality of the service and teaching load;
• Justification for how the amount of assigned time requested correlates to the work involved in the service activity;
• Demonstrated ability to be successful in accomplishing project goals and previous work in this area.

12.3.8. RECOMMENDATIONS
12.3.8.1. The ESSC shall rate each proposal based on the established criteria and rank order the proposals by total rubric score.
12.3.8.2. The ESSC shall submit its evaluations and the application materials to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs who shall make the final determination regarding the approval or denial of the proposals.

12.3.9. INFORMATION PROVIDED TO APPLICANTS
12.3.9.1. Once a decision is reached by the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, he/she will forward his/her approval or denial, and if denied, the basis for the decision, as well as the numeric score and ranking of their application.

12.3.10. APPEALS
12.3.10.1. Within 10 days following receipt of the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs’ decision, applicants may appeal the decision in writing to the Associate Vice-Provost for Academic Personnel. Appeals will be forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration. The FAC will consider the appeal at their next scheduled business meeting and will respond to the appellant in writing with a copy to the Provost. Decisions of the FAC shall be final and binding and are not subject to the grievance procedures specified in Article 10 of the CBA.

12.3.11. EFFECTIVE DATES
12.3.11.1. The policies and procedures in this document are an implementation of Article 20, section 37 of the 2014 – 2017 CBA. Due to the extension of the CBA through 2019 – 2020, the 2019 – 2020 academic year marks the end of this program and this policy shall no longer be in effect on or after June 30, 2020, unless Article 20.37 is specifically extended in the successor CBA to include additional awards in future years.
12.3.11.2. Academic Personnel shall maintain an updated calendar for the operations of the ESSC and the awarding of this assigned time for each academic year it is in effect.
SUSCAT Course Summary
for Academic Senate Consent Agenda

Note: The Resolution on Approving Assessment Process for Courses Meeting Sustainability Learning Objectives (AS-792-15) directs the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee (ASSC) to identify which courses to list on the Cal Poly Sustainability Catalog (SUSCAT) following the approved assessment process. The resolution also directs the ASSC to place SUSCAT course recommendations on the Academic Senate's Consent agenda. Assessments have taken place since 2015 to produce lists of Sustainability Focused and Sustainability Related courses. This memo lists only additional sustainability courses recommended for SUSCAT through October 2020, primarily courses new to the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 catalogs.

Date: Nov. 6, 2020

Fall 2020 Review – Sustainability Focused Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES TO LIST ON SUSCAT AS SUSTAINABILITY FOCUSED COURSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEPS 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATE 485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCI 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fall 2020 Review – Sustainability Related Courses

### COURSES TO LIST AS SUSTAINABILITY RELATED COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>GE Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA 520</td>
<td>Design with Cultural Landscapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEPS 205</td>
<td>Orchard and Vegetable Enterprise Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEPS 334</td>
<td>Greenhouse Vegetable Enterprise Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEPS 420</td>
<td>Organic Crop Production Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR 422</td>
<td>Stream Measurements and Water Quality Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 460</td>
<td>Senior Project Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVE 490</td>
<td>Environmental Nanotechnology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRC 437</td>
<td>Advanced Consumer Packaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP 341</td>
<td>Packaging Polymers and Processing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fall 2020 Review – Sustainability Related Courses

Cal Poly submitted its first STARS certification application to AASHE during February 2017. The application identified sustainability courses according to the STARS criteria for sustainability courses and courses that include sustainability.[1] AASHE/STARS describes the sustainability courses as “courses for which the primary and explicit focus is on sustainability and/or understanding or solving one or more major sustainability challenge.” Cal Poly interpreted this description as applying to those courses listed in Cal Poly’s Sustainability Catalog (SUSCAT).[2] Cal Poly identified courses for SUSCAT following the assessment procedure approved by the Academic Senate.[3] Summarized briefly, the procedure scores each course according to a rubric. Courses scoring 6-12 points on the rubric that also devote at least 20% of the course to sustainability get recommended as SUSCAT sustainability courses. The new courses proposed for listing appear in the first table above titled “Fall 2020 Review – Sustainability Focused Courses.”

AASHE/STARS also recognizes courses that include sustainability. This category covers “courses that are focused on a topic other than sustainability, but incorporate a unit or module on sustainability or a sustainability challenge, include one or more sustainability-focused activities, or integrate sustainability issues throughout the course.”[1] While reviewing courses for SUSCAT, it became clear that Cal Poly offers courses that don’t teach sustainability learning objectives sufficiently to appear as a SUSCAT sustainability course, but do teach elements of sustainability appropriate for the AASHE/STARS category covering courses that include sustainability. Those courses appear in the second table above titled “Fall 2020 Review – Sustainability Related Courses.”

The ASSC posts this list online at https://suscat.calpoly.edu/courses-category.

[1] AASHE/STARS.

11/16/20
TO: Academic Senators

2021-22 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.

2021-22 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**
- Agriculture Education & Communication Department
- Food Science and Nutrition Department

**College of Architecture and Environmental Design**
- Architectural Engineering Department
- City and Regional Planning Department
- Landscape Architecture Department

**College of Engineering**
- Aerospace Engineering Department
- Civil and Environmental Engineering Department
- Computer Engineering Department
- Electrical Engineering Department
- Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering Department
- Materials Engineering Department

**College of Liberal Arts**
- Communication Studies Department
- English Department
- Ethnic Studies Department
- History Department
- Interdisciplinary Studies Department
- Philosophy Department
- Psychology & Child Development
- Social Sciences Department
- Theatre & Dance Department
- Women’s & Gender Studies Department

**Orfalea College of Business**
- Business Area
- Industrial Technology and Packaging Area

**College of Science and Mathematics**
• Biological Sciences Department
• Kinesiology and Public Health Department
• Statistics Department

**Liberal Arts and Engineering Studies**

To view a college summary, go to the online [Curriculum Handbook](#). Click on Status of Proposals, scroll to 2021-22 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 February 2, 2021.

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."
RESOLUTION ON “POLY ACCESS” TEXTBOOK PROGRAM

Impact on Existing Policy: None.

WHEREAS, Follett’s Immediate Access (“Poly Access”) program was adopted without consultation with the Academic Senate, nor significant consultation with faculty nor students; and

WHEREAS, The “Poly Access” program profoundly shifts the nature of the relationship between student and bookstore; and

WHEREAS, Many students will be able to purchase books at lower cost because of the volume purchasing which Poly Access enables; and

WHEREAS, The Poly Access program raises serious concerns about increasing out-of-pocket costs for students by hundreds of dollars per quarter by automatically debiting their accounts for the cost of textbooks without sufficient notice and opportunity to opt-out; and

WHEREAS, Automatically opting students into such a system obviates their consent and threatens to undermine their autonomy by requiring them to opt-out of each textbook separately, each quarter; and

WHEREAS, Many Cal Poly students are of lower income or experience food insecurity, exacerbating these burdens; and

WHEREAS, These costs accrue to students’ state accounts, which can result in registration holds or failure to graduate; and

WHEREAS, Students are well-equipped to make informed decisions when shopping for textbooks to reduce their out-of-pocket costs; and

WHEREAS, An opt-in system, whereby students must take the deliberate action of choosing to receive their textbooks through the Poly Access program, would avoid the most serious concerns with the current system; and
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urges the Cal Poly Bookstore to change its "Poly Access" program to an opt-in program rather than an opt-out program, without requiring students to pay for textbooks by default, and be it further.

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly engage in more mindful and diligent consultation with faculty and student representatives when the Cal Poly bookstore implements changes to its interaction between itself and students or faculty, and be it further.

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly be mindful of the ethically salient impacts of decisions that have the potential to significantly negatively impact student finances without students’ knowledge or sufficient notice.

Proposed by: Ryan Jenkins (Associate Professor, PHIL)
Date: January 5, 2021
RESOLUTION ON “POLY ACCESS” TEXTBOOK PROGRAM

Impact on Existing Policy: None.

WHEREAS, Follett’s Immediate Access ("Poly Access") program was adopted without consultation with the Academic Senate, nor significant consultation with faculty nor students; and

WHEREAS, The "Poly Access" program profoundly shifts the nature of the relationship between student and bookstore; and

WHEREAS, Many students will be able to purchase books at lower cost because of the volume purchasing which Poly Access enables; and

WHEREAS, The Poly Access program raises serious concerns about increasing out-of-pocket costs for students by hundreds of dollars per quarter by automatically debiting their accounts for the cost of textbooks without sufficient notice and opportunity to opt-out; and

WHEREAS, Automatically opting students into such a system obviates their consent and threatens to undermine their autonomy by requiring them to opt-out of each textbook separately, each quarter; and

WHEREAS, Many Cal Poly students are of lower income or experience food insecurity, exacerbating these burdens; and

WHEREAS, These costs accrue to students’ state accounts, which can result in registration holds or failure to graduate; and

WHEREAS, Students are well-equipped to make informed decisions when shopping for textbooks to reduce their out-of-pocket costs; and

WHEREAS, An opt-in system, whereby students must take the deliberate action of choosing to receive their textbooks through the Poly Access program, would avoid the most serious concerns with the current system; and

Adopted:
WHEREAS, The Follett Canvas shell “Follett Access” is automatically populated into all courses by default appears to entangle the endorsement of a private company by instructors; therefore be it 

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urges the Cal Poly Bookstore to change its “Poly Access” program to an opt-in program rather than an opt-out program, without requiring students to pay for textbooks by default, and be it further 

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate urge Cal Poly to remove the Follett Access Canvas shell from being automatically included in every course’s Canvas shell by default, and be it further 

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly engage in more mindful and diligent consultation better consultation with faculty and student representatives when the Cal Poly bookstore implements changes to its interaction between itself and students or faculty, and be it further 

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly be mindful of the ethically salient impacts of decisions that have the potential to significantly negatively impact student finances without students’ knowledge or sufficient notice.

Proposed by: Ryan Jenkins (Associate Professor, PHIL)  
Date: October 25, 2020
WHEREAS, President Armstrong made Cal Poly a Charter Signatory to the Climate Leadership Commitment in 2016, establishing a goal for Cal Poly to achieve net zero carbon emissions from all sources as soon as possible (currently set for 2050); and

WHEREAS, The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has determined that we have less than ten years to make urgent and unprecedented changes to our carbon emissions to avoid the worst impacts of climate change; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Statement on Diversity seeks to develop awareness and empathy for global communities, including people who are from historically and societally marginalized and underrepresented groups; and

WHEREAS, Failure to reduce carbon emissions will result in increased risk of devastating hurricanes, flooding, droughts, fire, and food scarcity for hundreds of millions of people, especially for marginalized and underrepresented global populations most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change; and

WHEREAS, A 2050 target date arrives too late to prevent needless adverse impacts; and

WHEREAS, The City of San Luis Obispo has set a Carbon Neutrality date of 2035; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s carbon emissions link inextricably with the carbon emissions of the City of San Luis Obispo; and

WHEREAS, The entire University of California system has set a target of 2025 for carbon neutrality, and at least six CSU campuses have all set goals for carbon neutrality by 2030 or sooner, all of which are consistent with the targets of the IPCC report on climate change; and
WHEREAS, Including all on and off campus Cal Poly operations in Cal Poly's scope 1, 2, and 3 GHG inventory--including for example the Swanton Pacific Ranch, the Bartleson Ranch property, and the Technology Park--increases options for carbon neutral or carbon negative operations and development, commitment to high performance building standards, on-site renewable energy generation, and carbon sequestration in soils through the use of regenerative land management practices; and

WHEREAS, By accelerating the recommendations made in the Cal Poly Climate Action Plan dated April 26, 2017, the campus can achieve Carbon Neutrality in 2030; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends Cal Poly adopts carbon neutrality by 2030 or sooner.

Proposed by: Sustainability Committee
Date: January 5, 2021
WHEREAS, The Chancellor’s Office issued a revised Executive Order in December 2020 on CSU General Education Breadth Requirements; and

WHEREAS, This Executive Order creates Area F Ethnic Studies within CSU General Education; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the creation of Area F Ethnic Studies as indicated in the attached modification to the Template for General Education 2020.

RESOLVED: That it be implemented for all students following the 2021–2022 and subsequent catalogs.

Proposed by: General Education Governance Board
Date: January 26, 2021
**Template for General Education 2020**

_revised January 2021_

**Standard GE Template**
The Standard GE Template includes the following distribution of courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A: English Language Communication and Critical Thinking</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Oral Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Written Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area A</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area B: Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 Physical Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Laboratory Activity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area B</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area C: Arts and Humanities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages other than English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Division C Elective – Select a course from either C1 or C2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division C</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area C</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area D: Social Sciences</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 American Institutions (Title 5, Section 40404 Requirement)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Lower-Division D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area D</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area E: Lifelong Learning and Self-Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Division E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area E</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area F: Ethnic Studies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area F</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Electives in Area B, C, and D</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE Electives – Select courses from two different areas; courses may be at either lower- or upper-division levels.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in GE Electives</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Units in General Education Program** 72
GE Template for High-Unit Programs

This GE template includes the following distribution of courses for qualifying high-unit programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A: English Language Communication and Critical Thinking</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Oral Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Written Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area A</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area B: Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 Physical Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Laboratory Activity</td>
<td>in B1 or B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B Electives</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area B</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area C: Arts and Humanities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower-division courses in Area C must come from three different prefixes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages other than English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Division C Elective – Select a course from either C1 or C2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division C</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area C</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area D: Social Sciences</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 American Institutions (Title 5, Section 40404 Requirement)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D Elective – Select either a lower-division D2 or an upper-division D course</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area D</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area E: Lifelong Learning and Self-Development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Division E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area E</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area F: Ethnic Studies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area F</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area F</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL UNITS IN GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in General Education Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 "Consistent with EO 1100-R (2.2.5), Cal Poly recognizes the need to offer consideration to high-unit major degree programs. Cal Poly’s definition of a high-unit program in the GE template included herein is equivalent to our definition of “engineering programs” from the prior GE template: all programs within the College of Engineering along with the other ABET accredited programs of ARCE and BRAE. Only these programs will be considered high-unit major degree programs."

Source – AS-873-19: “Resolution on Template for General Education 2020”
RESOLUTION ON SUBJECT AREA GUIDELINES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION AREA F: ETHNIC STUDIES


WHEREAS, Education Code 89032 SECTION 2 SUBSECTION (b) requires that: “Commencing with the 2021-2022 academic year, the California State University shall provide for courses in ethnic studies at each of its campuses” and

WHEREAS, AB1460/ California Education Code 89032 SECTION 2 SUBSECTION (d) states: "Commencing with students graduating in the 2024–25 academic year, the California State University shall require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at minimum, one three-unit course in ethnic studies...." and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Ethnic Studies Requirement Working Group and the Ethnic Studies Area F Curriculum Sub-Group, and the General Education Governance Board have reviewed the Area F criteria and educational objectives, be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate approve the attached Subject Area Guidelines for General Education Area F: Ethnic Studies and be it further

RESOLVED: That these guidelines be used for the review of proposed General Education courses in Area F: Ethnic Studies.

Proposed by: Cal Poly Ethnic Studies Requirement Curriculum Sub Committee & the General Education Governance Board (GEGB)
Date: January 26, 2021
Subject Area Guidelines for General Education Area F: Ethnic Studies

The General Education (GE) program is compliant with CSU requirements and is uniquely tailored to our comprehensive polytechnic education. At Cal Poly all curriculum, including General Education curriculum, is designed and taught by faculty with appropriate training and disciplinary expertise. Educational objectives are expectations for student learning, the achievement of which can be periodically assessed. Course criteria are expectations for course design that will be used in the consideration of the course proposal, course modifications, and course renewal. Course criteria and educational objectives for General Education subject area F: Ethnic Studies are included below.

Ethnic Studies
Area F

Ethnic Studies in the United States is defined as an interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity with a focus on four racial/ethnic groups of people: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans. Thus, students acquire the knowledge that helps them comprehend the histories of settler colonialism, racism, white supremacy, and ethnocentrism in the United States and its development. They will learn to distinguish between structural and individual forms of racism. They will analyze the ways in which settler colonialism and racism intersect and interlock with other forms of oppression with regard to Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans. Students will learn about the intellectual and cultural contributions made by Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans. This knowledge will prepare and enable students to contribute to society as responsible and constructive community members who work to make the promise of equality in America a reality.

Area F courses shall not be waived or substituted. Area F courses shall have an Ethnic Studies prefix. Courses without an Ethnic Studies prefix may meet this requirement if cross-listed with a course with an Ethnic Studies prefix. Courses that are approved to meet this requirement shall meet at least three of the five Council on Ethnic Studies (CES) and California State University Academic Senate (ASCSU) approved core competencies. Campuses may add additional competencies to these core competencies but must meet the minimum standard of 3 of 5 core competencies for approval. Finally, Ethnic Studies courses required in majors, minors, or that satisfy campus-wide requirements and are approved for Area F shall “double count.”

CRITERIA

GE Area F courses must fulfill all of the following criteria. The course must:

CR 1: Have an Ethnic Studies prefix.
CR 2: Meet three out of five Council on Ethnic Studies approved core competencies (educational objectives).

CR 3: Focus on one or more of the following racial/ethnic groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans in the United States.

CR 4: Emphasize the voices and contributions of Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans such that the course must prominently include sources written and/or produced by them.

**Lower Division Educational Objectives**

EO 1: Distinguish between individual and structural forms of racism, exclusion, and other forms of inequality as they have been historically applied to Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and/or Latina and Latino Americans.

EO 2: Describe the most significant artistic, intellectual, cultural, and/or linguistic contributions made by Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and/or Latina and Latino Americans in the United States.

EO 3: Explain and critically review how struggle, resistance, racial and social justice, solidarity, and liberation, as experienced, enacted, and studied by Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and/or Latina and Latino Americans are relevant to current and structural issues such as communal, national, international, and transnational politics as, for example, in immigration, reparations, settler-colonialism, multiculturalism, and language policies (CSU Council on Ethnic Studies Core Competency).

EO 4: Describe and actively engage with anti-racist and anti-colonial issues and the practices and movements in Native American, African American, Asian American and/or Latina and Latino communities to build a just and equitable society (CSU Council on Ethnic Studies Core Competency).

EO 5: Critically analyze the intersection of race and racism as they relate to class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, tribal citizenship, sovereignty, language, and/or age in Native American, African American, Asian American, and/or Latina and Latino American communities (CSU Council on Ethnic Studies Core Competency).

**Upper Division Educational Objectives**

EO 1: Articulate and explain the most significant artistic, intellectual, cultural, and/or linguistic contributions made by Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and/or Latina and Latino Americans in the United States.

EO 2: Synthesize the historical narratives and/or intellectual traditions of Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans and/or Latina and Latino Americans in the United States.
EO 3: Apply theory and knowledge produced by Native American, African American, Asian American, and/or Latina and Latino American communities to describe the critical events, histories, cultures, intellectual traditions, contributions, lived-experiences, and social struggles of those groups with a particular emphasis on agency and group-affirmation (CSU CES Core Competency).

EO 4: Analyze and articulate concepts such as race and racism, racialization, ethnicity, equity, ethno-centrism, eurocentrism, white supremacy, self-determination, liberation, decolonization, sovereignty, imperialism, settler colonialism, and anti-racism as analyzed in any one or more of the following: Native American Studies, African American Studies, Asian American Studies, and Latina and Latino American Studies (CSU CES Core Competency).

EO 5: Critically analyze the intersection of race and racism as they relate to class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, tribal citizenship, sovereignty, language, and/or age in Native American, African American, Asian American, and/or Latina and Latino American communities (CSU CES Core Competency).
Impact on Existing Policy: This Resolution Supersedes AS-883-19 to Include Educational Objectives Specific to United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) Courses

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s Diversity Learning Objectives (DLOs) currently serve as the course learning objectives for United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) courses (AS-836-17 and AS-883-19), and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s Diversity Learning Objectives (DLOs) are a part of the broader framework of the University’s Learning Objectives (AS-663-08), and

WHEREAS, University Learning Objectives (ULOs) and Diversity Learning Objectives are intended to be met across the Cal Poly curriculum during a student’s progress to degree, and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s Diversity Learning Objectives are more expansive in their pedagogical scope than learning objectives for USCP courses and their criteria (AS-883-19), and

WHEREAS, The General Education Diversity and Inclusion Work Group determined in their 2019 report that USCP courses need educational objectives specific to these courses rather than educational objectives that were intended to be met across the university curriculum and across a student’s time at Cal Poly, and

WHEREAS, The current United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) Committee agrees with this recommendation by the General Education Diversity and Inclusion Work Group in their 2019 report, and

WHEREAS, Expectations for lower-division and upper-division educational objectives should be differentiated in United State Cultural Pluralism courses; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly adopt the attached United States Cultural Pluralism course criteria and educational objectives.

Proposed by: Academic Senate USCP Review Committee
Date: January 26, 2021
New USCP Course Educational Objectives

All Lower Division USCP courses must meet a minimum of four (4) of the following seven (7) educational objectives:

**Lower Division Educational Objectives**

EO1: Identify and describe the histories of racial, gender, sexual, economic, political, and other inequities in the U.S. and how they persist

EO2: Describe the ethical concerns within one’s discipline with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the United States.

EO3: Articulate and explain the most significant artistic, intellectual, cultural, and linguistic contributions, past and present, made by historically marginalized people in the United States.

EO4: Identify and define the aims of various individual, organizational efforts, and mass social movements such as the abolitionist, civil rights, feminist, and other movements that address various forms of discrimination in the United States.

EO5: Distinguish between individual and structural forms of exclusion and inequality; and, offer a structural analysis of social, economic, political, and other historical inequalities in the United States.

EO6: Understand and explain how historical narratives and other intellectual and/or disciplinary traditions are shaped by dominant groups in the United States and critically analyze their formations.

EO7: Explain and analyze how the various issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion are integral to fulfilling the core values of American institutions and American ideals such as those which guarantee freedom, equality, and democracy.

All Upper Division USCP courses must meet a minimum of four (4) of the following seven (7) learning objectives:

**Upper Division Educational Objectives**

EO1: Assess and Analyze individual, systemic, structural, and/or institutional forms of inequity and discrimination in the United States.

EO2: Synthesize and analyze historical narratives and other intellectual and/or disciplinary traditions in the United States.

EO3: Explain and analyze how the various issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion are integral to fulfilling the core values of American institutions and American ideals such as those which guarantee freedom, equality, and democracy.
**EO4:** Synthesize and explain the various theories about the development and maintenance of gender identities, sexualities, race/racism, ethnicity, economic inequality, and other interlocking systems of oppression in the United States.

**EO5:** Articulate and explain the most significant artistic, intellectual, cultural, and linguistic contributions, past and present, made by historically marginalized people in the United States.

**EO6:** Describe and analyze the social, behavioral, scientific, and psychological impacts of structural inequities in the United States.

**EO7:** Assess and analyze the issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in one’s major field of study and/or industry in the United States.

**USCP Criteria**

*Note: These were criteria adopted by AS-883-19 “Resolution on Updating the United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) Criteria” on December 3, 2019.*

USCP courses must fulfill all of the following criteria:

- **CR1:** Focus on one or more diverse groups (identified in the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity) whose contributions to American society have been impeded by cultural, legal, economic, and political conflict or whose social, cultural, legal, economic, and political opportunities have been restricted in the United States;
- **CR2:** Cover the historical and/or contemporary social issues resulting from conflict or restricted opportunities that include but are not limited to problems associated with discrimination based on age, ethnicity, gender, nationality, abilities, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, or race in the United States;
- **CR3:** Address the diverse intellectual, philosophical, and cultural perspectives of historically marginalized people in the United States;
- **CR4:** Emphasize the voices and contributions of historically marginalized groups in the United States such that the course content must prominently include sources written and/or produced by historically marginalized people;
- **CR5:** Foster critical thinking skills by using intersectional frameworks of analyses that are necessary for adequately understanding and analyzing various social issues related to diversity and equity in the United States;
- **CR6:** Require students to examine critically their own beliefs, attitudes, and potential biases related to historically marginalized people in the United States.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

AS-395-92 Resolution Relating to a Cultural Pluralism Requirement requires that, beginning with the 1994-96 catalog, all Cal Poly undergraduates must fulfill a cultural pluralism baccalaureate requirement that consists of a single course satisfying a defined set of criteria.

The AS-651-06 Resolution on Cal Poly Learning Objectives establishes University Learning Objectives as a broadly shared set of educational expectations for all students who complete an undergraduate or graduate program at Cal Poly.

AS-663-08 Resolution on Diversity Learning Objectives establishes the four Diversity Learning Objectives as a collective addendum to the ULOs.

AS-676-09 Resolution on United States Cultural Pluralism Requirement revises the USCP criteria to make the criteria simpler, broader, and more reflective of more recent changes to the DLOs and the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity.


Currently, there are no existing USCP learning objectives (LOs).

**Diversity Learning Objectives**

According to the University Learning Objectives (ULOs), “all students who complete an undergraduate or graduate program at Cal Poly should be able to make reasoned decisions ... based on a respect for diversity,” as defined in the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity. The Diversity Learning Objectives (DLOs) were established in 2008 as an addendum to the ULOs.

The following revised DLOs were approved by the Academic Senate on June 4, 2019:

All Cal Poly graduates should be able to:

1. Recognize and understand the contributions to knowledge and civilization that have been made by members of diverse cultural and gender groups and other historically marginalized people in the United States and across the world;
2. Understand the history of issues related to diversity, social and economic inequities, and political power in the United States and across the world;
3. Analyze the current social, political, artistic, and/or economic lives of historically marginalized people in the United States and across the world;
4. Analyze the various institutions and structures that create and maintain social, economic, and political inequality in the United States and across the world; and, identify those that offer redress for these issues;
5. Define and describe the various issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in their respective disciplines;
6. Critically examine their own personal beliefs, attitudes, and biases about historically marginalized people and cultures in the United States and across the world.

Source: Academic Senate Resolution AS-882-19
(1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.

(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.

(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
SUBCHAPTER 12.4: SABBATICAL AND DIFFERENCE IN PAY LEAVES

Impact on Existing Policy: The policies in UFPP 12.4 supersede all university policies on sabbatical and difference in pay leaves.¹

WHEREAS, University academic personnel policies are established by shared governance and included in “University Faculty Personnel Policies” (UFPP); and

WHEREAS, Sabbatical and difference in pay leaves are academic personnel policies that are not currently in UFPP; and

WHEREAS, University sabbatical and difference in pay leave policies warrant updating in light of practices in faculty units (e.g. colleges) that have reasonably deviated slightly from formerly established procedures; and

WHEREAS, For the past two years a pilot process of sabbatical leave review that dispenses with interviews has been successfully implemented in the College of Liberal Arts; and

WHEREAS, The policies contained in the report “Proposed Subchapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: SUBCHAPTER 12.4: Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves” reflect the abovementioned changes; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy included in the report “Proposed Subchapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: SUBCHAPTER 12.4: Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves” be included in UFPP, and be it further

RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise their personnel policy documents by Fall 2021 to include their implementation of the policies in UFPP 12.4 in their personnel policy documents.
Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: January 26, 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.
Proposed Subchapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document: SUBCHAPTER 12.4: Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves

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 Academic Senate approval of personnel policies including consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and clear identification of which policy documents have been superseded by a proposed change. Using this process, FAC updates UFPP on an as-needed basis.

FAC proposes to the Senate individual chapters or subchapters of UFPP, each covered by its own Senate resolution. FAC may also recommend that the Senate Executive Committee place non-controversial updates to personnel policies on the Senate consent agenda.

FAC is proposing to move sabbatical and difference in pay policies into UFPP and proposes some revisions to the existing policies on such leaves. The proposed policy revision is included in this document, preceded by a summary of its content, impact, and implementation, and a summary of the consultation with faculty units on this proposed chapter.

Summary of SUBCHAPTER 12.4: Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves

This subchapter covers sabbatical and difference in pay leaves. Its policies are drawn from the memo sent annually from the Provost to the colleges, library, and counseling services stating longstanding university policies on sabbatical and difference in pay leaves. That memo presents university level policy, guidance for procedures in the colleges, library, and counseling services, and provides the relevant articles from the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) for reference.

The policies in this subchapter state general principles, and provide requirements for sabbatical and difference in pay applicants and evaluators. Procedural details based on these policies would continue to be expressed in the memo from the Provost, as usual, but with references to UFPP in addition to the CBA. Colleges, the library, and counseling services shall adapt the policies and procedures expressed in the Provost’s memo into their own policies and procedures for sabbatical and difference in pay leaves.

Impact on Existing Policy

The policies in UFPP serve as a university level expression of policy based on the requirements and allowances in the CBA.

Most of the longstanding policies about sabbatical and difference in pay leaves remain as they were, with a few notable exceptions.

Colleges, the library, and counseling services must specify in their personnel policies document the criteria, policies and procedures relevant to sabbatical and difference in pay leave, in conformity with UFPP 12.4. Colleges, the library, and counseling services may implement additional requirements on their Professional Leave Committees (PLC), and if so, such additional requirements must be specified in their personnel policies documents.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2021
Proposed Subchapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:  
SUBCHAPTER 12.4: Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves

Previously the Professional Leave Committee (PLC) at the college level and at the library and in counseling services required interviews of all leave with pay applicants. The proposed policies allow a PLC to continue to include interviews with all applicants in their review procedures, or else entirely remove the interviews from the PLC procedures, but this choice has to be stated in the relevant personnel policies for the college, library, or counseling services. When a PLC interviews its applicants, the committee must report to the dean the impact of the interviews on the rank ordering of leave applicants.

The CBA requires department tenured faculty to review difference in pay leaves in the department. College level PLC review of sabbatical leaves is sufficient to comply with requirements that tenured faculty review sabbatical leaves without a lower level department committee review. The proposed policy clarifies discretion at the department level for evaluation of sabbatical leaves along with difference in pay leaves, and discretion at the college level for evaluation of difference in pay leaves, so long as the department and college policies specify these procedures. (Library and counseling services only make use of one faculty committee as their PLC.)

Previous university policies on PLCs required their members to serve two-year terms. This is no longer required.

Previously the dean would rank order leave applicants for the Provost, and do so in two separate lists. The PLC policies required a rank ordering of the applicants they evaluated in their report to the dean. The proposed policies separate sabbatical and difference in pay leave applicants into two distinct lists in PLC rank orderings for the dean for colleges who assign their PLC to review both sabbatical and difference in pay leaves.

Implementation

The establishment of UFPP by the Academic Senate obliges the Colleges and Library to restructure their faculty personnel policy documents into the same chapter division as UFPP. When the Academic Senate approves changes to UFPP and when those changes are ratified by the President, the Colleges and the Library will now have a focused area of revised policy that they must consult and, if necessary, use to revise their documents accordingly.

Colleges and the library need to place any of their policies on sabbatical and difference in pay leaves into chapter 12 (the chapter on Workload) of their personnel policy documents and conform their policies and procedures to the approved university level policy ahead of the next academic year.

If this policy is approved by the Senate and the President, colleges, the library, and counseling services need to decide whether to continue with the practice of interviewing all leave applicants, or else abandon interviews, and revise their policy documents accordingly. Colleges would also need to address the other matters explicitly left to their discretion, such as the scope of department leave committees to review sabbatical applications, and of the College PLC to review difference in pay leaves.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2021
Proposed Subchapter of University Faculty Personnel Policies Document:
SUBCHAPTER 12.4: Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves

The memo from the Provost should continue to be the main means of distribution of university policy and procedure concerning sabbatical and difference in pay leaves. That memo should cite the relevant sections of this subchapter of UFPP for reference, or extract the text of this subchapter in its entirety as an appendix alongside the articles of the CBA that are standardly provided in that memo.

Consultation with Faculty Units about UFPP

When proposing personnel policies, FAC consults with faculty units about the proposed change so the faculty units may offer feedback on the proposal. FAC then considers this feedback when revising the proposed policy and sending it to the Senate. FAC sent draft of the subchapter to the deans of the colleges and library, and asked Academic Personnel to consult with counseling services as well.

FAC receive minimal feedback, mainly general concurrence. The removal of the requirement that PLC members serve two-year terms arose from this feedback. CLA suggested that PLCs should include something like the Employment Equity Facilitators that are required to be included in faculty and staff recruitment committees. Any such innovation should be developed in colleges interested in doing so, with subsequent feedback to FAC about how that project works.

More feedback can be channeled through Senators as the policy undergoes standard Senate review.

What follows is the proposed text of the chapter...
12.4. Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves

12.4.1. [Chapter 12.4 was established by Academic Senate Resolution AS-XXX-21]

12.4.2. Sabbatical and difference-in-pay leaves are intended to provide a benefit to the university through research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement, or faculty retraining.

12.4.3. Deans or appropriate administrators are responsible for notifying eligible faculty and advising them of the application deadline.

12.4.4. Sabbatical Leave Eligibility

12.4.4.1. Full-time faculty unit employees, except coaches, are eligible to take an approved sabbatical leave after completing six academic years of full-time service within the past seven years, or at least six years after a previous sabbatical or difference-in-pay leave. Service credit granted towards the completion of the probationary period for tenure-track faculty shall also apply towards fulfilling the eligibility requirement for a sabbatical.

12.4.4.2. Eligible academic year faculty unit employees may apply for a sabbatical leave of one quarter in length at full pay, two quarters at 75% pay, or three quarters at 50% pay.

12.4.4.3. Applications for three-quarter sabbatical leaves shall meet the criteria set forth in CBA 27.5-27.8, including consideration of the quality of the proposal, effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department, other campus program needs, and campus and college budget implications.

12.4.4.4. Current 12-month faculty who are granted leave with pay may remain in 12-month status for the duration of the approved leave. Eligible 12-month faculty unit employees may apply for a sabbatical leave of 3 months in length at full pay, 6 months at 75% pay, or 9 months at 50% pay. The start date of a sabbatical leave for a 12-month faculty employee with instructional responsibilities shall coincide with the start date of the appropriate academic term.

12.4.4.5. Faculty employees serving as department chair/head (class codes 2481 or 2482) shall be assigned to the equivalent instructional faculty classification (2360 or 2361) for the duration of the sabbatical, and will not receive the department chair/head stipend while on sabbatical leave.

12.4.4.6. Grant-related instructional faculty (GRIF) must be converted to instructional faculty classifications for the duration of leave.

12.4.5. Difference-in-Pay Leave Eligibility

12.4.5.1. The initial eligibility requirement for a difference-in-pay (DIP) leave is the same as for sabbatical leaves (six years of full-time service within the past seven years).

12.4.5.2. For a subsequent DIP leave, faculty unit employees become eligible after serving full-time for three academic years following the last sabbatical or DIP leave.

12.4.6. Sabbatical and DIP leave applications must include clearly stated outcomes that benefit the university or CSU. It is critically important that those involved in reviewing leave applications recommend approval only of those applications that satisfy departmental, college and university criteria and meet the requirements of Articles 27.5-27.7 and 28.7-28.9 of the CBA.

12.4.7. Colleges, the library, and counseling services shall formalize sabbatical and difference in pay leave policies and procedures consistent with those in UFPP. Any refinement of the relevant criteria for sabbatical and DIP leaves, in conformity with the general principles stated in UFPP 12.4.2., shall be included in the college, library, or counseling services personnel policies document. Any enhancements to the policies, procedures,
and responsibilities in a college, the library, or counseling services shall be included in its personnel policies document.

12.4.8. Department Leave Committee (DLC)
12.4.8.1. As per CBA 28.7, difference in pay leave requires review by a Department Leave Committee (DLC). DLC members shall be elected by tenured and probationary faculty from that department. Faculty members eligible for membership are tenured, and not applying for a leave with pay. The DLC shall review all DIP leave applications and make a recommendation based on the quality of the leave proposal. The recommendation of the DLC is included in the application sent to the department chair/head.

12.4.8.2. Departments may choose to have their DLC review applications for sabbaticals. If so, the composition of the committee and its responsibilities are the same as for review of DIP leave applications. Departments choosing to have the DLC review sabbatical applications shall specify this process in their personnel policies.

12.4.9. Department Chair/Head Recommendations
12.4.9.1. Department chairs/heads shall state in a candidate’s application whether the department has adequate resources to replace faculty members, and whether such a leave, if approved, would cause undue hardship to offer the department’s program(s), and how the department will meet their teaching and other needs.

12.4.9.2. If an applicant is the current department chair/head, the appropriate associate dean shall make the equivalent recommendation.

12.4.10. Professional Leave Committees (PLC)
12.4.10.1. Each college, the library, and counseling services shall each convene their own Professional Leave Committees (PLC). As per CBA 27.5, PLC members shall be composed of tenured faculty who are not applying for a sabbatical or DIP leave.

12.4.10.2. The PLC shall review its leave applications to form recommendations to the dean or appropriate administrator based on the quality of the proposals. The Colleges, the Library, and Counseling Services may include PLC interviews of applicants as part of their formal application review process. Sabbatical leave applicants and DIP leave applicants may be separated in any college, library, or counseling services policies on inclusion of PLC interviews in their application review process.

12.4.10.3. The PLC shall rank order all recommended sabbatical leave applications, and separately rank order any DIP leave applications under the scope of its review. The PLC report shall clearly state to the dean or appropriate administrator the reasons for recommending denial of an application, and this report should be forwarded to the dean or appropriate administrator along with the leave applications.

12.4.10.4. College Professional Leave Committee (CPLC) members shall be elected from each department in the college. Tenured and probationary faculty in the department elect one departmental representative to the CPLC. The CPLC shall elect one of its members as chair of the CPLC. Colleges may include in their CPLC policies and procedures allowances that the CPLC also review DIP leave applications within the college.

12.4.10.5. The Library PLC (LPLC) shall consist of at least two tenured faculty librarians elected by all faculty librarians. The LPLC shall review all sabbatical and DIP leave applications from library faculty.

12.4.10.6. The Counseling Services PLC (CSPLC) shall include at least two tenured SSP-AR counseling faculty or tenured faculty librarians. Counseling services policies shall
determine the appropriate faculty to vote for CSPLC membership. The CSPLC shall review all sabbatical and DIP leave applications from counseling faculty.

12.4.11. Dean Recommendations
12.4.11.1. Deans shall review all sabbatical and DIP leave applications in their faculty units and make recommendations to the provost. The director of counseling services shall serve the equivalent role of dean for purposes related to sabbatical and DIP leaves.

12.4.11.2. Deans shall consider at least the following points when making recommendations for sabbatical and DIP leaves:
   • Benefit of the leave to the university
   • Merit of the proposal
   • Recommendations of the prior levels of review
   • Program needs
   • Campus budget implications.

12.4.11.3. Deans should be aware that faculty members from small departments should not be disadvantaged from obtaining a sabbatical or DIP leave.

12.4.11.4. Deans shall verify that post-leave reports have been completed for all previous sabbatical and DIP leaves prior to recommending approval.

12.4.11.5. Deans shall rank order all sabbatical leave applications that are being recommended (including all one, two- and three-quarter sabbatical applications). Deans shall separately rank order all DIP leave applications that are being recommended.

12.4.12. Provost Decision
12.4.12.1. The Provost is the final level of administrative evaluation for sabbatical and DIP leave.

12.4.12.2. The Provost shall review the candidate’s materials and reports from all levels of evaluation.

12.4.12.3. The Provost’s letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on sabbatical and DIP leave.

12.4.13. A copy of the completed leave application form with all appropriate signatures and a copy of the leave abstract and detailed leave proposal shall be placed into the candidate’s Personnel Action File (PAF).

12.4.14. Leave recipients shall submit a post-leave report to the college dean or appropriate administrator (with a copy to the department chair/head) within two months of their return from leave. The college dean or appropriate administrator is responsible for requesting and ensuring that the required post-leave report is obtained from each faculty member who took sabbatical or DIP leave upon the faculty member’s return to teaching. Upon receipt, the post-leave report shall be filed in the faculty member’s PAF.

12.4.15. Following the conclusion of faculty sabbatical or DIP leaves, the CBA articles 27 and 28 require recipients to return service to the CSU equivalent to the period of leave taken. Faculty who fail to return to Cal Poly employment will be required to repay the university for the amount of salary and benefits earned for the duration of their leave.
RESOLUTION ON NEW ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s Academic Senate approved the Resolution on Coordinated Campus Assessment Efforts (AS-735-11); and

WHEREAS, the “Membership and Appointment Procedures” section does not currently reflect campus expertise and interest in academic assessment; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached Revised Membership for Cal Poly’s Academic Assessment Council; and furthermore, let it be

RESOLVED: that the Revised Membership be put into effect immediately upon approval.

Proposed by: Academic Assessment Council
Date: January 5, 2021
Revised Membership for Cal Poly’s Academic Assessment Council

The Academic Assessment Council (AAC) shall be composed as follows:

Part I – Academic representatives from each academic unit appointed by the respective deans (8 total)

- College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
- College of Architecture and Environmental Design
- College of Engineering
- College of Liberal Arts
- College of Science and Mathematics
- Orfalea College of Business
- Graduate Education
- University Library

Part II – Faculty representatives appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee (8 total).

- College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences
- College of Architecture and Environmental Design
- College of Engineering
- College of Liberal Arts
- College of Science and Mathematics
- Orfalea College of Business
- School of Education
- Professional Consultative Services

Part III – Non-academic administrative representatives appointed by the respective heads of the departments (8 total).

- Academic Programs and Planning
- Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology
- Director of Academic Assessment (Academic Affairs)
- Director of Research and Assessment (Student Affairs)
- Information Technology Services
- Office of Institutional Research
- Office of University Diversity and Inclusion
- Office of Writing and Learning Initiatives
Part IV – Academic Senate committee representatives appointed by the Senate Executive Committee (2 total).

- General Education Governance Board
- Academic Senate Curriculum Committee

Part V – Student representatives appointed annually by the ASI president (2 total).

All representatives will be voting members.

The committee shall select its own chair, which shall be two (2) years long.

Term limits shall be for three (3) years and are renewable.
GRADUATION WRITING REQUIREMENT

AY 20-21 / Dawn Janke
All degree-seeking students, including Master’s degrees and teaching credentials, must fulfill the GWR before a diploma can be awarded.

**GWR Pathways:**

- Pass a GWR-certified upper-division course with a C or better on a major writing assignment and a final course grade of C or better with at least 35% of the final grade based on the cumulative grade of all writing projects; OR,

- Earn a passing score on a GWR portfolio (*The GWR portfolio replaces the Writing Proficiency Exam for academic year 20-21*).

**GWR Portfolio Requirements:**

1. Select two already-completed assignments from upper-division GE or major-specific courses upon which the student earned a C or better and upload them to the assignment folder in the GWR Portfolio Canvas site.

2. Write a 300-word writing development reflection and upload it to the assignment folder in the GWR Portfolio Canvas site.

The GWR Portfolio Canvas site provides detailed instructions for students. More information also is available at [www.writingandlearning.calpoly.edu/gwr](http://www.writingandlearning.calpoly.edu/gwr).

---

**Fall Quarter Portfolio Schedule**

1. **September 28, 2020.** Students with a Fall 2020 expected graduation term receive an invitation to the Fall 2020 GWR Portfolio Canvas site.

2. **November 20, 2020.** Students expecting to earn their degrees in December 2020 submit their portfolio contents for review on or before this date.

3. **December 4, 2020.** Upon satisfactory completion of GWR portfolio requirements, students receive a message confirming GWR completion.
A total of 306 students completed the GWR Portfolio in fall quarter. Ninety percent of students (n=276) passed without revision. Thirty students were provided with feedback and invited to resubmit.

Of those 30 who were asked to resubmit materials, several students simply needed to follow submission guidelines whereas others needed to upload another paper that met the criteria. Students responded quickly to revision requests and satisfied the milestone in a timely manner.

No student failed the portfolio.
**NEXT STEPS**

> **Return to GWR Course Criteria**
> Consult with GWR-designated course instructors to consider any necessary revisions to course criteria and/or professional development opportunities; Finalize the workflow so that newly proposed GWR-designated courses are evaluated through the senate’s curriculum approval process and are searchable via Schedule Builder.

> **Codify the GWR Portfolio**
> Replace the Writing Proficiency Exam in response to the Chancellor’s Office March 2020 directive by formalizing the GWR Portfolio Program as an alternative pathway to GWR completion. *Resources will be central to this goal; it may be necessary to shift the $35 WPE fee shift to a $35 portfolio fee, which would provide funding for portfolio evaluators.*

> **Create GWR Program Learning Outcomes**
> Develop specific, measurable PLOs “to ensure students have the instruction and practice needed in order to achieve university writing outcomes without the use of in-person testing,” as per the March 2020 CO memorandum. These PLOs should guide GWR Program assessment and ensure pathways to GWR completion (GWR course criteria, GWR Portfolio) align with University learning objectives.
RESOLUTION TO SET CAL POLY’S CARBON NEUTRALITY TARGET DATE

WHEREAS × 8, We’re screwed if we don’t; and

WHEREAS, By accelerating the recommendations made in the Cal Poly Climate Action Plan dated April 26, 2017, the campus can achieve Carbon Neutrality in 2030; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends Cal Poly adopts carbon neutrality by 2030 or sooner.
2030 is 10 – 40 years too late

Climate-related disasters worldwide†
1980-1999: 3,656
2000-2019: 6,681

>350 ppm in 1990
>400 ppm in 2017

IPCC 2014

BAU ➔ > 4°C by 2100
± 3-4°C by 2100
± 2-3°C by 2100
< 2°C by 2100

† Harper’s Index, Harper’s Magazine, Jan. 2021, p. 11
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Figure 1.1 Steps of the Climate Action Plan Process

1. Laws & policies
2. Current campus climate
3. Vulnerability assessment

1. Goals, Obj., & Strategies
2. GHG reduction
3. Adaptation
4. Implementation & monitoring

1. Tracking progress
2. Inform future updates

Dr. Adrienne I. Greve
City and Regional Planning Dept.

PolyCAP - Contents

Sector Icons:

- Agriculture
- Buildings
- Campus Life
- PPP
- Renewable Energy
- Solid Waste
- Transportation
- Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAP Identity</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>GHG Reduction (MTCO2e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building 1.1.1</td>
<td>All new and retrofitted buildings reduce annual energy demand per gross square feet (GSF) by at least 50% from that of the former building or similar type of building</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 1.3.2</td>
<td>Require all buildings to offset emissions from natural gas consumption</td>
<td>8,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building 2.1.1</td>
<td>Retrofit inefficient windows</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 1.1.2</td>
<td>Implement an anaerobic digester</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 1.3.1</td>
<td>Utilize sequestration via sustainable range management</td>
<td>2,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture 2.1.2</td>
<td>Resilient livestock</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation 1.1.3</td>
<td>Establish a climate impact fee for each parking permit issued</td>
<td>2,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation 1.2.1</td>
<td>Increase frequency and reliability of bus service</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation 1.3</td>
<td>Promote sustainable transit, bicycle, and walking for students, faculty and staff</td>
<td>5,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation 2.1</td>
<td>Decrease use of campus owned vehicles</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation 3.1.1</td>
<td>Carbon offsets for long distance travel</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water 1.1</td>
<td>Reduce landscaping water emissions by 95%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP Identity</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>GHG Reduction (MTCO2e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water 2.2</td>
<td>Water conservation to prepare for drought</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste 1.2</td>
<td>Expand Zero Waste campus wide</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Life 1.3</td>
<td>University housing surrounding the academic core for &gt;65% of students</td>
<td>16,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Life 2.1</td>
<td>Reduce on-campus energy use by residential students</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy 1.2</td>
<td>Microgrid on campus</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy 2</td>
<td>Produce electricity from solar and wind on campus buildings and land</td>
<td>2,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Private Partnerships 1.1</td>
<td>Faculty and staff housing on campus</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>44,566</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The best available information suggests that, on average, future losses are reduced by about $3 (measured in discounted present value) for each $1 spent on those projects, including both federal and nonfederal spending.”
Whereas, Including all on and off campus Cal Poly operations in Cal Poly's scope 1, 2, and 3 GHG inventory--including for example the Swanton Pacific Ranch, the Bartleson Ranch property, and the Technology Park--increases options for carbon neutral or negative operations via low-impact-development, commitment to high performance building standards, on-site renewable energy generation, and carbon sequestration in soils through the use of regenerative land management practices;
“When your house is on fire, you don’t wait another 10, 20 or 30 years before calling the fire department. When your house is on fire, you don’t wait another 10, 20 or 30 years before you stop actively pouring petroleum on the flames. You act now. In every way you possibly can.”

@GretaThunberg, Jan. 4, 2021
Click to edit Master title style

https://plana.earth/academy/what-are-scope-1-2-3-emissions/
PROPOSED CHANGES to the
ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Michael V. Nguyen, Ph.D.
Academic Programs and Planning
Director of Academic Assessment
Chair, Academic Assessment Council
BACKGROUND FROM 2011 TO TODAY

Why are we here?

In 2011, the WASC/Academic Senate Assessment Task Force proposed the formation of the Academic Assessment Council (AAC) to coordinate and direct “campus assessment efforts.” The Senate approved this proposal with the passage of “Resolution on Coordinated Campus Efforts” (AS-735-11). **While technically a university committee – because the membership, mission, and bylaws come from AS-735-11 – the AAC asks the Senate to review and approve this revised membership.**

Why are these changes being proposed now?

Over the past decade, there have been many efforts to strengthen and unify academic assessment at Cal Poly. Updating this resolution will reflect that progress with a stronger representation of campus experts and stakeholders on the council.
Membership Changes

PART I

In general, updated unit names as appropriate (e.g., Academic Programs → Academic Programs and Planning; CTL → Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology). Additionally, constituencies are organized in a more logical way.

- Part I – Addition of Graduate Education
- Part II – Addition of School of Education
- Part III – Addition of Director of Academic Assessment, OUDI, and OWLI
- Part IV – Addition of ASCC (at the recommendation of the Executive Committee)
- Part V – Increase from 1 to 2 student representatives
MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

PART II

- AAC chair will go from a one-year to two-year term.
- All members will now be voting members.
- Increase from 21 to 27 total members.
  - Formalizes the contributions of many members who regularly attend AAC meetings but are not current representatives.
Thoughts or questions?
Thank you!