I. Minutes: none.

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

III. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: matters to come before the Senate this year; new curriculum appeals process
B. President's Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA Campus President:
G. ASI Representative:
H. Committee and Caucus Chair(s):

IV. Special Report(s):

V. Consent Agenda:
Approval of curriculum proposals appearing on page 2 of this agenda: Schaffner, chair of the Curriculum Committee (p. 2).

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Clarifying Academic Program and Institutional Assessment:
   Fernflores/Giberti/Keesey, first reading (pp. 3-4).
B. Resolution on Academic Senate Operating Procedures for Its Committees:
   Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 5-8).
C. Resolution on Modification to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Allow for Electronic Voting:
   Executive Committee, first reading (p. 9).
D. Resolution on Modification to Academic Program Review Procedures:
   Executive Committee, first reading (p. 10).

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment:
Continuous Course/Curriculum Summary
For Academic Senate Consent Agenda

Note: The following courses/programs have been summarized by staff in the Registrar’s Office for review by the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee (ASCC) and Academic Senate (AS)

Date: June 1, 2010

Winter/Spring 2010 Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate (AS)</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASCII/BIO/BMED 593 Stem Cell Research Internship (5) supv</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/27/10, approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCII/BIO/BMED 594 Applications in Stem Cell Research (2) 1 sem, and supv</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/27/10, approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 534 Principles of Stem Cell Biology (2) 2 sem</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/27/10, approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE/EE 133 Digital Design (4) 3 lec, 1 lab</td>
<td>Reviewed 6/3/10, approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE/EE 233 Computer Design and Assembly Language Programming (4) 3 lec, 1 lab</td>
<td>Reviewed 6/3/10, approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSB 573 Marketing Research (4) 4 lec</td>
<td>Reviewed again 6/3/10, approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem Cell Research Specialization, MS Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/27/10, approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem Cell Research Specialization, MS Biological Sciences</td>
<td>Reviewed 5/27/10, approval recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2011 - pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, As a university accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), Cal Poly is expected to assess educational effectiveness “at each level of institutional functioning” (Criteria For Review 4.4); and

WHEREAS, The General Faculty acknowledges its responsibility for teaching and concern for student learning; and

WHEREAS, Academic assessment is here defined as the consideration given to the evidence of student learning based on stated program and university outcomes; and

WHEREAS, The purpose of assessment is to support academic planning and program improvement; and

WHEREAS, To be effective, the process of assessment must focus not on the individual student or faculty member but on the program or institution; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That findings or data resulting from assessment at the program or university levels should be of a general nature and not linked to individual faculty members; and be it further

RESOLVED: That findings or data resulting from such assessment must not be used in making retention, tenure, and promotion decisions nor placed in an individual faculty member’s personnel action file; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate oversees university-level assessment; and be it further

RESOLVED: That faculty members may report assessment activities as appropriate as a form of teaching, scholarship, or service.

Proposed by: R. Fernflores, B. Giberti, and D. Keesey
Date: September 21 2010
Revised: September 28 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR #</th>
<th>Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFRI</th>
<th>Self-Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.</td>
<td>Cal Poly has clear policies and practices that provide quality assurance at each level of institutional functioning. For example, all proposals for new or substantially modified programs, curricula and courses are reviewed by peer committees and administrators at the department, college, and institutional levels. Reviewers' findings are communicated to those making the proposals, often resulting in improvements to the proposals. All academic programs undergo periodic program review, with standard program data provided by IP&amp;A and external reviewers in effect benchmarking against other institutions. Programs are required to maintain assessment plans and prepare action plans intended to turn recommendations into realized improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHEREAS, The current set of operating procedures for Academic Senate standing and ad hoc committees was adopted in 1989 as Resolution AS-306-89 (attached); and

WHEREAS, The procedures outlined in AS-306-89 contain outdated information; and

WHEREAS, New operating procedures are needed that conform to changes made to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Section VIII.D “Operating Procedures” and to acknowledge the widespread use of electronic communications for committee deliberations; and

WHEREAS, Confusion over the definition of “meeting” has occurred due to the widespread use of electronic communications for committee deliberations; and providing a definition of “meeting” will improve the reading of bylaws section VIII.D, “Operating Procedures”; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That Academic Resolution AS-306-89, “Resolution to Provide a Generic Set of Operating Procedures for Academic Senate Standing and Ad Hoc Committees” be repealed; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the operating procedures appearing in section VIII.D of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate supersede AS-306-89; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the attached modifications to section VIII.D of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be adopted by the Academic Senate of Cal Poly.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 21 2010
Bylaws of the Academic Senate

VIII.D. OPERATING PROCEDURES

Operating procedures for Academic Senate standing and ad hoc committees are as follows:

1. A committee meeting is defined as “a deliberative gathering of individuals—either physically or electronically, as appropriate—for the purpose of reviewing, discussing, or deciding on matters assigned by the Academic Senate Executive Committee.”

2. A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.

3. Chairpersons serve until the end of the academic year. In the event that a chair must miss a meeting, s/he shall appoint a substitute chair for that meeting.

4. Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chair or upon the request of three members of the committee. Committees are required to meet at least once per quarter during the school year. Regular meetings shall be scheduled during normal work hours.

5. Notification of meetings shall be sent by the committee chair at least three working days before the meeting date. Committees may establish regular meeting times. Upon committee agreement, a regular meeting time shall constitute notice.

6. Members may not vote by proxy.

7. A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting shall be the decision of the committee.

8. Minutes shall be kept for each meeting and a copy transmitted to the Academic Senate office.

9. Special rules and procedures must be approved by the Executive Committee, included in the committee’s description, and on file with the Academic Senate office.

VIII.E. MEETINGS

Meetings of all committees, except those dealing with personnel matters of individuals, shall be open. The time, place, and manner and place of each meeting shall be announced in advance.
BACKGROUND MATERIAL

Adopted: January 31, 1989

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

Background statement: The Academic Senate bylaws specify that each committee shall have written operating procedures on file in the office of the Academic Senate. These are to be reviewed by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is proposing this set of generic operating procedures to assist committees in meeting this requirement. It could be accepted as a blanket procedure unless a committee prefers to draft its own. This draft was accepted unanimously by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee in January 1988 and affirmed by a vote of 6-0 on October 11, 1988. Vacant membership on the committee included SAED, SSM, and ASI.

AS-306-89/C&BC

RESOLUTION TO
PROVIDE A GENERIC SET OF OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES

WHEREAS, Article VII Section D of the Academic Senate bylaws specify each committee shall have a written set of operating procedures on file in the Senate office; and

WHEREAS, A generic set of procedures will be acceptable to many committees; and

WHEREAS, Any committee requiring greater detail and specificity in operation can propose and have them accepted; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the generic operating procedures for Academic Senate committees (attached) be accepted.

Proposed By:
Constitution and Bylaws Committee
November 1, 1988
Revised January 10, 1989
RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE A GENERIC SET OF OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE STANDING AND AD HOC COMMITTEES

AS-306-89/C&BC

Page Two

OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE COMMITTEES

The committees of the Academic Senate, both standing and ad hoc, in compliance with Article VII, Section D, of the bylaws must have an approved set of operating procedures on file in the office of the Academic Senate. Excepting elected committees which must have specific operating procedures approved by the Senate, committees may elect to be governed by these procedures or must develop and submit for approval the procedures they will employ in the conduct of their charges.

1. A simple majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum for a meeting. A quorum is required to conduct business.

2. Chairpersons shall be elected by the majority vote at the first meeting of the academic year called by the Chair of the Senate. Chairpersons serve until the end of the academic year. In the event that a chairperson must miss a meeting, the chairperson shall appoint a substitute chairperson for that meeting.

3. Meetings shall be called at the discretion of the chairperson or upon the request of three members of the committee. Committees are required to meet at least once per quarter during the school year. Regular meetings shall be scheduled during normal work hours.

4. Notification of meetings shall be sent by the chairperson at least three (3) working days before the meeting date. Committees may establish regular meeting times. Upon committee agreement, a regular meeting time shall constitute notice. Decisions made at meetings may not be challenged for lack of proper notice either if all members attend or if all sign statements waiving the notice requirement.

5. Decisions of the committee must be made at meetings in which the attending members are in simultaneous communication with each other. This excludes telephone polling of members unless accomplished with conference phone with all members included.

6. Members may not vote by proxy.

7. A vote by the majority of the voting members attending a meeting shall be the decision of the committee.

8. Voting shall take place by a show of hands unless one attending member requests a secret ballot. The record shall show the resulting vote.

9. A committee report explaining the decision and noting the vote leading to the decision of the committee shall be filed at the Academic Senate office. Minority reports also may be filed with that office.
WHEREAS, Currently, the Bylaws of the Academic Senate outline procedures for electing members to the Academic Senate, Academic Senate offices, the Academic Senate CSU, and elected committees; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for these elections call for a “double envelope system” (outside envelope signed, inside envelope sealed and containing the voted ballot); and

WHEREAS, Incorporating an option for using electronic voting technology would provide a means for both casting a ballot and counting ballots electronically; and

WHEREAS, The advantages of casting electronic ballots and counting ballots electronically include: (1) the move to a paperless voting system; (2) the savings of time and materials used in preparing, mailing, and counting paper ballots; (3) and a greater level of voter anonymity provided by cryptographic verification; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That Section III.A of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as follows:

Balloting procedures shall utilize either an electronic voting system or a shall be by ‘double envelope system’ (outside envelope signed, inside envelope sealed and containing the voted ballot), whichever is more appropriate to the nature of the election and which ensures that only eligible persons will vote and ballots will remain secret;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That Section III.A.5 of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as follows:

Ballots will be counted electronically if electronic voting is used; or if the ‘double envelope system’ is used, ballots will be counted only if they are properly signed and received by the announced closing date. Individual voting information Ballots will be retained for ten working days.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 21 2010
ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-___-10

RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATION TO
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURES

WHEREAS, Academic program review procedures for baccalaureate and graduate programs were first implemented in 1992 along with the formation of an Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee; and

WHEREAS, Procedures for adding and selecting internal reviewers (Cal Poly faculty members outside the program who are “knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review”) and external reviewers (individuals from other educational institutions) to academic program review were drafted and approved in 1996; and

WHEREAS, In 2000, after extensive study of academic program review practices nationwide, a new process for academic program review was proposed for Cal Poly by the Task Force on Institutional Accountability and Learning Assessment; and

WHEREAS, The 2000 academic program review process—which eliminated the Academic Senate Program Review and Improvement Committee—was approved by the Academic Senate on November 21 2000 as “Resolution on Academic Program Review,” resolution number AS-552-00; and

WHEREAS, The 2000 academic program review process calls for the Academic Senate Executive Committee to be the final approving body for the program’s internal reviewers; and

WHEREAS, A Kaizen (“continuous improvement”) pilot project reviewed the current academic program review process in early 2010 and recommended “removing Senate [Executive Committee] approval” from the process in order to remove steps that resulted in redundant approval since the internal reviewer nominations are already “selected and vetted by the program faculty and endorsed by the college deans and the vice provost”; and

WHEREAS, Waiting for Academic Senate Executive Committee approval often delays the appointment of the internal reviewer(s) and causes the academic program review process to run behind schedule; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate Executive Committee be removed as the final approving body in the appointment of internal reviewers for academic program review; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Programs Office provide annual summaries to the Academic Senate on the findings of academic programs that underwent academic program review in that year.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: September 21 2010