I. **Minutes:** Approval of January 26, 2016 minutes (pp. 2-3).

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

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

IV. **Special Report:**
   AB 798 and the Open Educational Resource (OER) Adoption Incentive Program by Dana Ospina, OER Task Force chair. (p. 4).

V. **Business Items:**
   A. Appointment of Josh Machamer as GE Governance Board chair for spring 2016.
   B. Resolution Requesting that Cal Poly Administration Develop an Integrated Strategic Plan: Sean Hurley, Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee chair (pp. 5-33).

VI. **Discussion Items:**
   A. Definition of Membership of the General Faculty in the Constitution of the Faculty: Gary Laver, Academic Senate chair (pp. 34-38).
   C. Academic Calendar: (pp. 40-50).

VII. **Adjournment:**
I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the Executive Committee minutes from January 5, 2016.

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

III. Reports:

A. Academic Senate Chair: Gary Laver, Academic Senate Chair, announced that the ballots for Senate seats have gone out and will be counted on Tuesday, February 16 at 10am in the Academic Senate Office. After the election, four Senate seats will be vacant (one in CAED, one in OCOB, and two in COSAM). Laver has also scheduled a meeting with Sevelyn Van Ronk, the Chair of UUAB, to talk about the temperature of UU220.

B. President's Office: Rachel Femflores, Interim Chief of Staff, reported that President Armstrong will be meeting with the Board of Trustees in March to discuss approval for the new development in P3 for housing staff and faculty.

C. Provost: Mary Pedersen, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Planning, mentioned that the GE Review Team will be on campus to evaluate Cal Poly. There is also a new proposal for the restructuring of the Honors Program that will go to the Executive Committee and the Academic Senate.

D. Statewide Senate: Manzar Foroohar, Statewide Senator, described the three-day meeting of the Statewide Senate and the passing of resolutions, such as including lectures in orientation programs for new faculty and restoring research scholarships as a line item in the budget. The policy for HR 2015-08 on background checks did not change but a fourteen-point guideline was provided for each campus and a task force is in the process of being formed. Jim LoCascio, Statewide Senator, explained the role of AB-386 Public Postsecondary Education: Cross-Enrollment: Online Education at the California State University.

E. CFA: none.

F. ASI: Owen Schwaegerle, ASI President, reported that since ASI purchased the rights to the Cal Poly P, it has now been reopened. Two resolutions were passed on a Sustainable Financial Model for the CSU and Open Course Evaluations. Vitto Monteverdi, ASI Chair of the Board, discussed that the ASI Board of Directors will be voting on establishing an ad hoc committee on capping ASI campaign spending, as well as creating funds for low-income candidates. There will also be a vote on a resolution opposing the Phillip 66 rail line that will run through San Luis Obispo County.

IV. Business Item(s):

A. Resolution to Open Educational Resources Task Force: M/S/P the appointments to the Open Resources Task Force for Winter and Spring 2016:
Mark Stankus, Mathematics
Catherine Waitinas, English
Amy Wiley, English

A1. Approval of Clark Turner from Computer Science to replace Gregg Fiegel on the GE Governance Board for Winter and Spring 2016: M/S/P to approve Clark Turner, Computer Science, to replace Gregg Fiegel for Winter and Spring 2016.
B. Resolution to Amend the Definition of Membership of the General Faculty on the Constitution of the Faculty: Gary Laver, Academic Senate chair. M/S/P to agendize the resolution with the following changes:

1. remove the strikethrough on "employees in" from line 31,
2. remove the word "full-time" from line 56, and
3. add "Elected senators and officers have to be a voting member of general faculty as defined by Article 1 with appointment for their term of service" as Section (e).

V. Adjournment: 5:00pm

Submitted by,

Denise Hensley
Academic Senate Student Assistant
Open Educational Resources (OER) Adoption Incentive Program
Task Force
Winter and Spring 2016

Charges:
1. Develop a resolution that states its support to increase student access to high-quality OER and reduce the cost of textbooks and supplies for student. The Academic Senate must approve the resolution.
2. In collaboration with students and campus administration, create and approve a plan that describes evidence of the faculty's commitment and readiness to effectively use grant funds to support faculty adoption of OER.

Timeline:
01.26.16 - Appoint committee members
04.19.16 – Present resolution and plan to Executive Committee
05.03.16 – Present resolution and plan to Academic Senate for first reading
05.24.16 – Present resolution and plan to Academic Senate for second reading

Must be submitted for review by June 30, 2016

Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Represents</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archie, Tim</td>
<td>61522</td>
<td>tarchie</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Director of Assessment &amp; Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddad, Anthony</td>
<td>awhaddad</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazempour, Reza</td>
<td>65302</td>
<td>rkazempo</td>
<td>University Store</td>
<td>Academic Courseware Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montoya, Natalie</td>
<td>nrmontoy</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ospina, Dana (CHAIR)</strong></td>
<td>67581</td>
<td>dospina</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>Library – Academic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stankus, Mark</td>
<td>61716</td>
<td>mstankus</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitinas, Catherine</td>
<td>62136</td>
<td>cwaitina</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley, Amy</td>
<td>62780</td>
<td>awiley</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

02.02.16
WHEREAS, It is important to have a tool that communicates and facilitates where the University is headed and how it will get there; and

WHEREAS, A strategic plan is one tool that can assist in communicating and facilitating the University’s vision and mission; and

WHEREAS, A strategic plan is a valuable tool that can guide resource decisions to efficiently achieve the University’s vision and mission; and

WHEREAS, A strategic plan for a university does not need to be considered a static document; and

WHEREAS, An important component to all strategic plans are the goals and actions that will assist the organization to meet its mission and vision; and

WHEREAS, In May 2011, the Academic Senate at Cal Poly adopted resolution AS-728-11 Resolution on the Strategic Plan, that called upon the Academic Senate to “create or instruct a committee to work collaboratively with the administration on further developing and implementing the Cal Poly strategic plan”; and

WHEREAS, On June 28, 2011, President Armstrong acknowledged receipt of Senate resolution AS-728-11; and

WHEREAS, In May 2014, Cal Poly President Jeffrey Armstrong provided the campus with a new vision statement, Vision 2022, which he developed from various campus conversations with faculty and staff; and

WHEREAS, The last formally written strategic plan for Cal Poly was developed in 2009 for the WASC accreditation before President Armstrong developed his Vision 2022 statement; and

WHEREAS, The University is currently updating its master plan and its academic plan which makes it an opportune time to update its strategic plan; and

WHEREAS, The University in its Program Review process has acknowledged the importance of goals and actions with corresponding information regarding who is the responsible party that will undertake the goal/action, the priority of the
goal/action, resource implications to achieve the goal/action, the timeframe the

goal/action will be completed, and important milestones towards achieving the
goal/action; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate through this resolution demonstrates its approval of
President Armstrong’s Vision 2022 statement; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee take the charge of
working with the Administration to update Cal Poly’s 2009 strategic plan to
incorporate President Armstrong’s Vision 2022; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee ensures that the new
strategic plan has a succinct set of specific measurable goals and actions, key
performance indicators for these goals and actions, and a timeline for the goals
and actions to be accomplished; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly has an updated and completed strategic plan by May 2017; and be
it further

RESOLVED: That the Budget and Long Range Committee is charged to work with the
Administration in implementing and providing oversight to the newly developed
strategic plan.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Budget & Long-Range Planning Committee
Date: January 21, 2016
Adopted: May 3 2011

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA
AS-728-11

RESOLUTION ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN

WHEREAS, A strategic plan can be summarized as a framework to achieving the institution's long-term goals and objectives; and

WHEREAS, The key components of a strategic plan should be composed of a vision statement, a mission statement, a set of goals to achieve the mission and vision, and a set of key performance indicators; and

WHEREAS, The vision of the institution describes the overarching long-term goals of the institution; and

WHEREAS, The mission of the institution describes why it exists; and

WHEREAS, The goals in the strategic plan should be specific, measurable, and should lead to the achievement of the institution's vision and support its mission; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate believes that a strategic plan is a necessary component to moving the University towards it long-term goals, and a strategic plan acquires operational utility when it provides a framework for collaborative decision making and institutional alignment; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate strongly supports strategic planning as an essential component of institutional success and recognizes a necessary condition for a successful strategic plan is collaboration and acceptance among a broad assortment of the Cal Poly community, including the General Faculty, administration, staff and students; and

WHEREAS, The vision in The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 moves Cal Poly toward becoming the premier comprehensive polytechnic university; and

WHEREAS, The Report of the WASC Visiting Team Capacity and Preparatory Review states that there is a need to "...continue to refine their [Cal Poly's] definition of a comprehensive polytechnic university in ways that can be embraced by all members of the University," and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 provides a framework for continuing discussion and a summary of where Cal Poly stands as an institution; and
WHEREAS, Identifying peer and aspirational institutions and key performance indicators are activities central to measuring Cal Poly's progress toward achieving our strategic goals; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 proposes several decisions which are consistent with maintaining and enhancing the core competencies of Cal Poly including preparing whole system thinkers, increasing integration of faculty, staff and students, Learn-By-Doing as a core pedagogy, and restoring economic vitality; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate endorse The Cal Poly Strategic Plan – V7 as an emerging framework to provide guidance on academic operational decisions and planning across Cal Poly; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate create or instruct a committee to work collaboratively with the administration on further developing and implementing the Cal Poly strategic plan; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate continue to work collaboratively with the Cal Poly community to further develop and enhance Cal Poly's identity as a comprehensive polytechnic university; and be it further

RESOLVED: Any key performance indicators used to measure Cal Poly's progress toward goals elucidated in the strategic planning process should be specific, measurable, and should be informative as to whether the institution is making progress towards its identified goals.

Proposed by: WASC/Academic Senate Strategic Plan Task Force
Date: February 22 2011
Revised: April 25 2011
Revised: May 3 2011
CAL POLY STRATEGIC PLAN – V7

STRATEGIC PLAN PURPOSE
The primary purpose of this Cal Poly strategic plan is to provide the direction and core framework for institution-wide continuous strategic planning and future initiatives. This plan together with divisional and unit, and college and department strategic planning, shall align with WASC reaccreditation and also will form the foundation for the Cal Poly capital campaign planning.

The plan articulates the Vision for Cal Poly and outlines the system for tracking progress relative to that Vision. This will include the perspectives of key stakeholder groups and be benchmarked relative to comparison institutions groups. The plan expresses the core values for the institution, individual and community, and summarizes the immediate specific strategic decisions. The process to develop action plans and strategic initiatives is outlined.

Note that in addition to the annual review of progress, the plan itself will be reviewed and updated each year as needed.

VERSION HISTORY
The original Version 1 of the plan was developed during fall quarter 2008 and disseminated for comment January 15, 2009. It had been built on several existing strategic planning documents including the Access To Excellence CSU plan, college strategic plans, and the reports of the 2008 strategic planning Five Working Groups discussed at the August 21, 2008 strategic planning workshop.

After extensive feedback on Version 1 during spring quarter 2009 from the campus community and external partners, Version 2 of the plan was developed. That version was presented and discussed with the President’s Cabinet and university leadership, May 2009. Based on their feedback, successive Versions 3-6 were circulated among the Cal Poly leadership, central administration and college leaders. This current working draft Version 7 has been developed based on that combined feedback.

It should be noted that while the structure, form, style and expression in Version 7 differ significantly from the original Version 1, most of the core elements of the original version remain. Feedback on this current working draft Version 7 is invited.

Erling A. Smith
Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives and Planning
SUMMARY

VISION
- Nation's premier comprehensive polytechnic university
- Nationally recognized innovative institution
- Helping California meet future challenges in a global context

TRACKING PROGRESS
- We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators
- The key performance indicators will be directly linked to the vision and connected to the different perspectives of the primary stakeholder groups
- We will measure ourselves against a comparison institutions group
- Each year we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution
- Each year, we will review proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investment

VALUES
- Institutional
  - excellence, continuous improvement and renewal
  - transparency, open communications and collaboration
  - accountability, fiscal and environmental responsibility
- Individual
  - professionalism, personal responsibility, and ethical
  - lifelong learner and seeking personal excellence
  - campus citizen and team member
- Community
  - multicultural, intellectual diversity and free inquiry
  - inclusivity and excellence, mutual respect and trust
  - civic engagement, social and environmental responsibility

DECISIONS
- Enhancing differentiation
  - Continue to develop unique comprehensive polytechnic identity
  - Shift definition to all majors as "polytechnic" preparing whole-system thinker graduates
  - Increase integration and interlinking of disciplines, faculty, staff and students
  - Build on core Learn-By-Doing pedagogy to ensure all students have a comprehensive polytechnic multi-mode education
- Restoring economic viability
  - Strategically manage revenue, costs, allocation or resources, improve effectiveness and efficiency
  - Shift mix of students to increase proportion of graduate students and international students
  - Implement institution-wide vision-driven and evidence-based decision-making and continuous improvement
  - Adopt and implement comprehensive enrollment management

ACTION
- All divisions and colleges will develop plans linked to this institutional plan and its strategic decisions.
- Plans will be tied to the institutional Mission and Vision identifying the contributions and roles, and highlight opportunities for collaboration and partnering.
- The plans will encompass the stakeholder perspectives, incorporate Cal Poly values and use the institutional key performance indicators along with other appropriate metrics.

APPENDIX
VISION
Premier polytechnic, innovative institution, helping California
Cal Poly will be the nation’s premier comprehensive polytechnic university, a nationally recognized innovative institution, focused to help California meet future challenges in a global context.

Questions and Answers
The Vision statement raises several strategic questions: Is this vision consistent with the Cal Poly mission? Is the vision achievable from our current position? What are the gaps between our vision, mission and our current position? Does the vision align with our preparation for WASC? Are we committed to being the best at our defined mission? Do we agree that Cal Poly is defined as a comprehensive polytechnic university with the mix of professional, STEM, humanities and social science programs that implies? Do we wish to define ourselves in terms of polytechnic colleges, polytechnic programs and/or polytechnic students? Do we accept the recommendation to expand our expectations of students to emerge from Cal Poly as whole-system thinkers? Do we continue to commit ourselves to project based learning – the emerging definition of “learn by doing”? Are we committed to transparency of process, sustainability of operations as an element of whole-system thinking, and innovation as a necessary element of continuous improvement? Do we accept that the arc of history for Cal Poly implies a continuing growth of our graduate student proportion? Do we accept the premise that resources determine size? (Does not necessarily limit growth, but focuses on how growth might be achieved rather than just hoping for state money.) Do we endorse a definition for productivity of the University as the best possible graduate per unit of resources expended?

Is this vision consistent with the Cal Poly mission?
Yes. Each of the three primary aspects of the vision statement – premier polytechnic, innovative institution and helping California – aligns and crosslinks to each of the three core aspects of the mission – teaching and learning, scholarship and research, and outreach and service – as expressed in our mission statement:

“Cal Poly fosters teaching, scholarship, and service in a learn-by-doing environment where students and faculty are partners in discovery. As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly promotes the application of theory to practice. As a comprehensive institution, Cal Poly provides a balanced education in the arts, sciences, and technology, while encouraging cross-disciplinary and co-curricular experiences. As an academic community, Cal Poly values free inquiry, cultural and intellectual diversity, mutual respect, civic engagement, and social and environmental responsibility.”

However, while the mission statement describes our historic, enduring and continuing institutional purpose, the vision statement is an elevation, pointing to where we wish to go from our current position.

Is the vision achievable from our current position?
Our current position is that Cal Poly is a well-established, recognized and highly ranked institution; a comprehensive polytechnic state university, with baccalaureate and
graduate level programs in science-, technology- and mathematics-based professions, and academic and professional programs in the arts and sciences. Cal Poly is known for its learn-by-doing environment and comprehensive multi-mode educational experience that prepares graduates for successful lives and careers as long-term performers and leaders in agriculture, architecture, the arts, business, education, engineering and the sciences. Cal Poly and many of our programs enjoy very high ranking. Competition for our unique Cal Poly education is extremely strong as is the demand for Cal Poly graduates because of their ready-on-day-one capabilities and long-term performance and leadership. Cal Poly contributes significantly to the economy and well-being of California. Clearly, our current position is on the trajectory towards achieving the vision.

What are the gaps between our vision, mission and our current position?

The vision calls us to be the premier comprehensive polytechnic university. Cal Poly graduates must be second to none. The total educational environment and experience we provide must enable the growth and learning of our students so they emerge as premier graduates with the skills they need for sustained future success in the challenges ahead. We must commit to ensuring our curricula and programs are the best and are continuously improving. We must ensure that the student learning we intend — as expressed in our University Learning Objectives, and program and course outcomes — is being achieved and demonstrated by robust assessment methods. In addition, we must make sure that all aspects of our support operations are focused on ensuring the progress and success of our students.

In parallel, we must commit to continuing development and expansion of our individual skills and excellence—faculty continuing their development as teachers, scholars and campus citizens, and staff and administrators continuously improving as skilled professionals and lifelong learners. Every new hire must be better than the last and even better than any one of us! Regardless of position, each of us must be dedicated to the progress and success of our students.

Meanwhile, we must continue to work hard on improving the Cal Poly learning and support infrastructure. In spite of excellent progress on the Master plan at providing many new academic buildings and residence halls during the past decade, continued progress will be far more challenging in the years immediately ahead. Many classrooms are in urgent need of renovation and upgrade. The increasing scholarly expectations on faculty have increased demand for more research laboratories, better computing facilities and an upgraded and expanded library and similar vital “common goods” of a successful university. However, we will need to be more creative and innovative, and where appropriate use technology as part of the solution to these challenges.

Does the vision align with our preparation for WASC?

Definitely. The principal theme of our WASC self-study has been “Our Polytechnic Identity” examined from different points of view including integrated student learning, the teacher-scholar model and learn-by-doing. These align and crosslink to the three principal aspects of the vision — premier polytechnic, innovative institution, and helping California. The work of all the WASC groups has contributed to the development of the strategic plan and expression of our vision.
Are we committed to being the best at our defined mission? – creates a commitment to continuous reflection, self examination and improvement.

Yes. We have a long history of leadership in undergraduate higher education and because of the reputation we have earned we attract the highest quality student and have built a faculty and staff of the highest standing. Our unique Cal Poly mission remains relevant and central; and our graduates because of their inherent quality, abilities and skill sets they possess are ever more critical to help California meet its current and future challenges.

To continue to be the best, every year we must seek to be better than the year before, with intentional continuous reflection, examination and improvement of all we do, at both the individual and institutional levels. Indeed, the primary purpose of the strategic plan is to provide the common direction and shared core framework for continuous strategic planning and future initiatives as we seek to be even better.

Thus, we need to review all aspects of the mission and prioritize. Then, we will need to track our progress continually and benchmark ourselves against a comparison institutions group to make sure our trajectory and position is right. No single measure and no single point of view will be sufficient so we will need to monitor several – though a limited set of – quantitative progress, quality and resources indicators, balancing the different aspects and perspectives of the Cal Poly mission. Each year, we will report and score our progress, balancing the different aspects, and examine opportunities for improvements, strategic initiatives and investments.

For example, we need to pay more attention to improving the graduation rate and student progress to degree; we need to systematically listen to alumni and employers to ensure the quality of our education and graduates is always relevant and moving forward; we also need to develop ways to demonstrate and highlight faculty scholarship in its fullest sense and showcase these important contributions; and we need to continually upgrade our facilities and infrastructure.

Do we agree that Cal Poly is defined as a comprehensive polytechnic university with the mix of professional, STEM, humanities and social science programs that implies?

Yes. We are both a comprehensive university and a polytechnic university and these two overlapping aspects of the Cal Poly identity reinforce each other. The range of our programs provides us intellectual breadth, balance and institutional strength and is an important reason for our continued success and durability. An important arm of our strategy is to continue to enhance this competitive advantage of our institutional differentiation.

Cal Poly is a polytechnic university, one of only 12 four-year universities/campuses nationwide with "polytechnic" in their name. A feature common to most "polytechnic" institutions is a focus on programs in math-, science- and technology-based professions. Certainly this is true for Cal Poly with over 1/3 of the degrees being in the STEM fields, 3/4 of the degrees in the Professions, and 84% of our degrees in the Professions and STEM combined.

In addition, the Professions and STEM is a common unifying component of our Cal Poly identity. For example, all Cal Poly colleges have at least one program that is in the Professions, and almost all our colleges have programs that are in STEM. Further, CLA and CSM, in addition to their majors in the Professions, STEM, and other academic...
disciplines, play a critical role in the foundational general education core of all our graduates.

Cal Poly is also a comprehensive university. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies institutions by their graduate programs using four field groupings: Humanities, Social Sciences, STEM and the Professions. Carnegie identifies an institution as “comprehensive” only if it has graduate-level programs and graduates in all four Carnegie field groupings. Perhaps surprisingly only 21% of the 1213 institutions overall and only 13% of the 804 master’s level institutions are in this category. Of the 12 “polytechnic” and 24 “institute of technology” four-year institutions combined only 5 are classified as comprehensive: three doctoral level research universities and two master’s level universities; and only three are designated as polytechnic. We are one of only very few “comprehensive polytechnic” universities. [See the Appendix for more information on Carnegie classifications and Cal Poly and also http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp]

Do we wish to define ourselves in terms of polytechnic colleges, polytechnic programs and/or polytechnic students?

For many years, we have used the total enrollment in CAFES, CAED and CENG as our surrogate measure of how “polytechnic” we are, but that is a limiting construct and not fully representative of the broader scope of the polytechnic identity of Cal Poly today. Polytechnic universities have a significant focus on undergraduate and graduate programs – typically technology, science, or math-based – that prepare individuals for professional careers. This is certainly true of Cal Poly but we now have programs in the Professions in every college, i.e. extending well beyond our historic “polytechnic” colleges.

Regardless of their major, all Cal Poly graduates will need much more of their education to tackle the challenges of the future. Of course, they will continue to need the depth of knowledge of their discipline that we have always provided. But this depth must also be integrated with breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences – a comprehensive polytechnic general education. Therefore, we will need to develop our programs further to prepare all our students regardless of the major to become “comprehensive polytechnic” graduates.

Do we accept the recommendation to expand our expectations of students to emerge from Cal Poly as whole-system thinkers – implies an expansion of project based learning to highly interdisciplinary teams?

It is clear that the problems of today and the challenges of tomorrow for California and in a global context will need graduates who have depth and breadth in an integrated education and are whole-system thinkers. The challenges are many and most are complex requiring a multi-disciplinary and integrated interdisciplinary team rather than a solo individual approach.

Cal Poly graduates are valued for being “ready day one” and also being long-term high performers and typically have the characteristics needed. However, we need to ensure this is an intentional outcome and added value of the educational experience we provide. We should look at all our programs both individually and collectively to ensure that the full set of learning experiences do indeed prepare our students for the challenges of their future.
Future Cal Poly graduates should have integrated breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences and depth of their total education to be whole-system thinkers and leaders. These will be important differentiators of Cal Poly graduates. They should demonstrate expertise, work effectively and productively as individuals and in multidisciplinary teams, communicate effectively, think critically, understand context, research, think creatively, make reasoned decisions, use their knowledge and skills, and engage in lifelong learning. This will be true for all our graduates regardless of major, preparing them for full and enriching lives, ready for entry into their chosen careers or advanced study and to contribute to society.

Meanwhile each of us should model the expectations we have of our graduates, i.e. from working effectively and productively as individuals and as part of a multidisciplinary team, to being life-long learners and whole-institution thinkers, and campus citizens, sharing a common purpose – the success of our students.

Do we continue to commit ourselves to project based learning – the emerging definition of “learn by doing”?

We must ensure that we remain leaders and innovators in higher education pedagogy, this must be part of Cal Poly being the best. Learn-By-Doing is a core part of a Cal Poly education and a well-known part of our identity differentiating us from other institutions. LBD provides our students hands-on active learning beyond and complementing their work in the classroom and their co-curricular activities.

Like all aspects of our pedagogy, we must continue to improve and enhance LBD to intentionally mobilize higher levels of learning. Project-based learning (PBL) can be classified as a mode of LBD; and capstone projects are an example of PBL. But LBD, PBL, and capstone experiences are opportunities for a deeper, richer education to develop the whole-system thinker, comprehensive polytechnic graduate for the future. We should explore introducing these integrative experiences early in a student’s time with us, perhaps as a foundational part of all our curricula.

Are we committed to transparency of process, sustainability of operations as an element of whole-system thinking, and innovation as a necessary element of continuous improvement?

Transparency must be a fundamental Cal Poly value together with open communication, accountability, evidence-based decision-making, and continuous improvement. All of these will assist us in our strategy of restoring economic viability. This past year we have been working hard to improve access and sharing of institutional data and in easy-to-understand formats; we have also been working on improving internal communications particularly in these difficult times of budget uncertainty.

Meanwhile, Cal Poly is a leader in sustainability of operations with a well-developed process and a record of progress to continuously improve our performance. We also have expertise in sustainability as an academic and research field. Indeed, fully-developed, sustainability can embody whole-system thinking.

We need to be innovative and creative as we seek continuous improvement and renewal in our programs and in our operations. Cal Poly also has opportunity to contribute to the field of innovation, another potentially integrative theme we have expertise in and should develop further.
Do we accept that the arc of history for Cal Poly implies a continuing growth of our graduate student proportion?

Yes. Although approximately 10% of Cal Poly degrees are at the master’s level, overall both graduate enrollment and its proportion have been declining slightly during the past decade; currently it is at about 5% of the total enrollment. Increasing our graduate proportion would yield many benefits.

For many of our majors, a baccalaureate degree is considered only an “entry-level” degree and increasingly a graduate degree is considered the first “professional” degree. Indeed, several employers have moved to hiring only at the advanced degree level.

A greater proportion of graduate students would increase the heterogeneity of the campus population, increasing the presence of national and international students and enhancing the education of all. Graduate students also serve as academic role models for our undergraduates. A deeper graduate education presence would help us further develop our research and would certainly enhance our national and international reputation. It would also support faculty in becoming teacher-scholars.

We would have to identify strategic opportunities for growth in areas where we have strength and reputation, and can build on our existing infrastructure. Note that we do have some competitive advantage of having made only a limited investment in graduate programs so far and thus we have the opportunity to be selective, creative and agile.

Do we accept the premise that resources determine size? (Does not necessarily limit growth, but focuses on how growth might be achieved rather than just hoping for state money.)

As part of our strategy to restore economic viability, we need to decouple our institutional size from the state allocation as much as is feasible. For example, the Cal Poly Plan and the College-Based Fee recognize our unique and different mission and higher cost and quality of the education we provide. We need to carefully steward and manage all our resources, continually look for ways to streamline our activities without sacrificing Cal Poly quality.

We also need to explore expanding non-state revenue sources, again without sacrificing quality. Examples include out-of-state and international students as an increasing proportion of our students, licensing intellectual property; increased grants income and continuously growing philanthropy.

We should build on our core strengths and competitive advantages wherever possible, have a sound business plan and monitor returns on such investments.

Do we endorse a definition for productivity of the University as the best possible graduate per unit of resources expended?

This expresses the value that Cal Poly has always provided. We know our graduates are among the best – we must maintain and continue to improve their quality. We must look toward ensuring more of our students reach graduation, by facilitating progress to degree, improving year-by-year retention, as always without compromising our standards. This provides value to each individual and all students while also improving our performance and efficiency.
Cal Poly has a long history of being the best; we must never take that position for granted, we must earn it every year, and every year we must do better, even in these the most difficult economic times.

TRACKING PROGRESS
Key performance indicators, stakeholder perspectives, and comparison institutions

We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators. The key performance indicators will be directly linked to the Vision and connected to the different perspectives of the primary stakeholder groups. We will measure ourselves against comparison institutions groups using target benchmark levels for the key performance indicators. Each year, we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution. Each year, proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investments will be reviewed. As needed, colleges, departments and administrative units will develop action plans and pursue strategic initiatives.

Use Key Performance Indicators

We will track progress toward achieving the vision using key performance indicators, measures of progress (quantitative outcomes), quality (level of service), and resources (financial, personnel and facilities.) Note that every year we will review each key performance indicators and assess continued relevancy and value. Sample key performance indicators are listed below:

PROGRESS indicators include: student success measures: graduation rates e.g. 6-year, 5-year, and 4-year, year-by-year retention rates, progress-to-degree rates, disaggregated; institutional and program rankings; demographic heterogeneity: proportion of students and employees by ethnic, gender, socio-economic, international categories; numbers of graduates, graduates in the Professions and STEM fields, and advanced degree graduates; student learning: attainment of University Learning Objectives and program and course objectives; faculty excellence: annual institutional total scholarly contributions, teacher-scholar indicator (to be developed), research grants, patents, etc.; staff excellence: % in-range progressions and awards; revenue: value and basis of endowment, annual operating revenue from all sources; and sustainability of operations: BTU/sq.ft.

QUALITY indicators include: surveys, annually of students and employees, multi-year of alumni and employers, quarterly of departing students and employees; retention rates of continuing and non-continuing students and employees; satisfaction surveys of employers with graduates’ depth of knowledge and breadth of skills; and student-to-faculty ratio.

RESOURCES indicators include: expenditures per student: faculty-to-student ratio, student support staff to student ratio, enrollment capacity to student ratio, cost of instruction per graduate, expenditures per faculty: faculty support staff to faculty ratio, and development expenditures per annual gift income.
KPIs Aligned to Vision

- Premier comprehensive polytechnic university
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - Comprehensive range of programs
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Quality of faculty and facilities
  - Student-to-faculty ratio
  - Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
  - Diversity and heterogeneity
  - Cost-of-attendance
  - Strategic allocation of resources
  - Annual gift and endowment growth
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

- Nationally recognized innovative institution
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - National awards
  - Innovative academic and co-curricular programs
  - Development of Comprehensive Polytechnic Graduate
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Faculty scholarly output
  - Continuous quality improvement
  - Use of appropriate technology
  - Sustainable practices
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

- Helping California meet future challenges in a global context
  - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
  - Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
  - Number of graduates going on to graduate school
  - Entering student quality
  - Diversity and heterogeneity
  - CA intellectual property and innovation
  - CA competitiveness and economic impact
  - Institutional financial needs
  - Communication of successes, achievements, awards, and economic impact

Include stakeholder perspectives

The KPIs will be linked to the three aspects of the vision statement: “the nation’s premier comprehensive polytechnic university,” “a nationally recognized innovative institution,” and “focused to help meet the challenges of California in the global context.”
The four perspective groups include those of: external accountability groups such as governing bodies and accreditation agencies; our external beneficiaries such as potential, continuing and completing students, parents, employers of our graduates and research funding agencies; internal individuals such as employee professional growth and development to maintain the intellectual capital and intrinsic institutional value embodied in individual faculty, staff, management and executive personnel; and internal institutional perspectives such as those quality aspects in which we must excel namely our programs, support activities, operations, resources, and advancement.

Note that every year we will review the relevancy of each key performance indicators relative to the vision and the perspectives of stakeholder groups.

**KPIs Aligned to Stakeholder Perspectives**

- **External accountability**
  - **Governing Bodies**
    - Ranking and program recognition
    - Comprehensive range of programs
    - Diversity and heterogeneity
    - Retention and graduation rates
    - Graduate attainment of learning objectives and outcomes
    - National awards
    - Continuous quality improvement
    - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need
    - Diversity and heterogeneity
    - CA intellectual property and innovation
    - CA competitiveness and economic impact
  - **Accreditation Agencies**
    - Skills and abilities of graduates
    - Robust assessment of learning
    - Programs
    - Resources – faculty, facilities and finances
    - Professional development and currency of faculty, staff, management and executive
    - Continuous quality improvement
    - Entering student quality

- **External beneficiaries**
  - **Students**
    - Program choice, ease of migration
    - Student life and satisfaction
    - Access to faculty
    - Rankings
    - Innovative academic and co-curricular programs
    - Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
    - Number of graduates going on to graduate school
  - **Parents**
    - Student-to-faculty ratio
    - Graduation rate (4-yr)
Cost-of-attendance
Mentoring and support, safety
Ranking and Program recognition
National awards
Number and availability of jobs and employment rate of graduates
Number of graduates going on to graduate school

- *Alumni*
  - Ranking and Program recognition
  - National awards
  - Economic impact Institutional financial needs

- *Employers*
  - Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills
  - Quantity of graduates in area of need

- *Research Funding Agencies*
  - Quality of faculty and facilities
  - Faculty track record
  - Institutional support infrastructure

- *San Luis Obispo*
  - Economic impact
  - Environmental impact
  - Community impact

- Internal individual
  - *Faculty*
    - Support expenditures per faculty
    - Satisfaction with instructional and scholarship support infrastructure
    - Publication and other scholarly output
    - Teacher-Scholar metric
    - Student progress-to-degree
    - Number of graduates going on to graduate school

  - *Staff*
    - In-rank progressions and professional development opportunities
    - Opportunities for innovation
    - Student progress-to-degree

  - *Management*
    - Resources
    - Opportunities for innovation
    - Student progress-to-degree

  - *Executive*
    - Ranking
    - Faculty, student and program national awards
    - Patents, licenses, and intellectual property
    - Number and quality of graduates in areas of CA human resources need

- Internal institutional
  - *Academic Affairs*
Retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates
Student-to-faculty ratio
Strategic allocation of resources
Faculty scholarly output
Development of intellectual resources
Use of appropriate technology
Development of Comprehensive Polytechnic Graduate
Quality of graduate – depth of knowledge and breadth of skills

- **Administration & Finance**
  - Expanded number and amount of revenue sources
  - Continuous quality improvement
  - Strategic allocation of resources
  - Use of technology as appropriate
  - Sustainable practices

- **Student Affairs**
  - Residential facilities and student life
  - Innovative co-curricular programs
  - Well-rounded, balanced graduates

- **University Advancement**
  - Annual gift and endowment growth
  - Communication of successes and achievements, awards, economic impact

**Measure against comparison institutions**

We will measure ourselves against a comparison institutions group of 4-year institutions. It should be emphasized that this group is not presented as a “peer” group or an “aspirant” group to which we aspire. While some institutions in the group may be considered peers and some may be those we aspire to emulate in some aspects, included are also institutions that could be classified as sub-peers in some or many categories and in that they may look to Cal Poly as a model to aspire to.

The comparison group was developed from three subgroups: National sample subgroup, Polytechnic and Institute of Technology subgroup, and Other Regional Competition subgroup. The National sample subgroup includes institutions from each of the six regional accreditation regions, California Postsecondary Education Commission four-region comparison institutions, and University of California and California State University systems. Criteria for inclusion in the National sample are: Carnegie categories, institutional mission and program mix, student quality and institutional selectivity, ranking, and financial aspects. Carnegie categories considered are Basic, Size and Setting, and Enrollment Profile. Institutional mission and program mix includes the proportion of the Professions to the Arts and Sciences, presence of programs in agriculture, architecture and engineering, polytechnic or institute of technology, comprehensive or STEM-focused graduate instructional program. Student quality and institutional selectivity includes mean SAT or ACT scores and acceptance rates. Ranking includes scores and percentile rank in US News and World Report category. Financial aspects include instruction budget per student and endowment yield per student.

The comparison group includes some polytechnics and institutes of technology, a coop-based university, and some regional competitors. It also includes a few institutions
recognized to be “on the move to the next level” with strategic plans successfully implemented and measured progress. Almost all institutions have graduate level programs, and most are public though some are private institutions. No single institution is like Cal Poly but the group taken as a composite contains important aspects of Cal Poly.

The preliminary 2009 comparison institutions group are shown in the table following. During fall 2009 quarter, the office of Institutional Planning and Analysis will conduct a detailed analysis of each of the candidate institutions with respect to the KPIs and stakeholder perspectives. IP&A will report on possible changes to the group that would include significantly reducing the number of institutions that we will track in future years. In addition, colleges and other units are encouraged to review the institutions from their perspective and relevancy. Similarly, note that during each and every year of the plan, and consistent with the principle of continuous improvement, we will critically review each of the institutions at a detailed level for their continued candidacy in the group.

**Comparison Institutions 2009**

[By Carnegie category, then by sample subgroup: national, polytechnics and institutes of technology, and other regional competition]

- **Research University/Very High Activity**
  - Cornell University
  - University of California, Davis
  - University of California, San Diego
  - University of Colorado – Boulder
  - University of Connecticut
  - Georgia Institute of Technology
  - Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
  - Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
  - University of California, Irvine
  - University of California, Santa Barbara
  - University of California, Santa Cruz
  - Washington State University

- **Research University/High Activity**
  - Clemson University
  - Drexel University
  - University of Maryland – Baltimore County
  - Missouri University of Science and Technology
  - Polytechnic Institute of New York University

- **Doctoral Research Universities**
  - Worcester Polytechnic Institute

- **Master's Level**
  - Boise State University
  - Northern Kentucky University
  - University of North Carolina, Wilmington
  - University of Northern Iowa
  - Arizona State University Polytechnic
Target benchmark levels for the key performance indicators will be developed for Cal Poly relative to the comparison institutions group. For key performance indicators where external data is available, the target levels for Cal Poly will be in the upper half of the comparison institution group for all, in the upper ranks for most, and leading in several key performance indicators. Note that each year we will review the benchmark levels for continuing currency and update as needed.

**Review our Status**

Each year, we will review our status, looking for opportunities for improvement and realignment throughout the institution. Key performance indicators will be continuously monitored and reported annually for Cal Poly as a whole institution, and by college and program, division or unit. Annual action plans will be reviewed and amended as needed. Each year, proposals for action, realigning, opportunities, initiatives and investments will be reviewed. As needed, colleges, departments and administrative units will develop action plans and pursue strategic initiatives. Strategic initiatives to take advantage of new opportunities or to improve progress will be reviewed. In addition, the key performance indicators themselves along with the comparison institutions groups will be reviewed for continued appropriateness and relevancy and updated as needed.

**VALUES**

_institutional, individual, and community_

Cal Poly is committed to the learning, progress and success of our students

- **Institutional**
  - excellence, continuous improvement and renewal
  - transparency, open communications and collaboration
  - accountability, fiscal and environmental responsibility

- **Individual**
  - professionalism, personal responsibility, and ethical
  - lifelong learner and seeking personal excellence
  - campus citizen and team member

- **Community**
multicultural, intellectual diversity and free inquiry
• inclusivity and excellence, mutual respect and trust
• civic engagement, social and environmental responsibility

STRATEGIC DECISIONS
Enhancing differentiation and restoring economic viability

The key strategies to achieving the vision are those that maintain Cal Poly differentiation, leverage core competencies, and sustain competitive advantages, together with those that restore financial viability by strategically managing revenues, costs and allocation of resources. Detailed institutional action plans for proceeding with the following strategic decisions are in development. However, part of this strategic plan is that every campus unit should examine their role and contribution with respect to these initiatives.

○ Cal Poly will continue to develop its unique comprehensive polytechnic university identity by emphasizing programs in the professions that are science-, technology- and mathematics-based, and academic and professional programs in the arts and sciences.
  • Maintains our institutional differentiation
  • Leverages our existing core competencies
  • Sustains our competitive advantage

○ Cal Poly will define all majors as “polytechnic” having depth of expertise in the professional or academic discipline, and breadth, balance and literacy in technology, the arts and sciences, integrated seamlessly to prepare whole-system-thinker graduates.
  • Increases our institutional differentiation
  • Leverages our existing core competencies
  • Sustains our competitive advantage
  • Expands our inclusivity and strengthens sense of community and commonality
  • We will need curricula development activity

○ Cal Poly programs will be more integrated to connect and interlink our disciplines, faculty, staff and students, all as partners in teaching, learning, scholarship and service, to provide a comprehensive polytechnic educational experience and common polytechnic identity.
  • Increases our institutional differentiation
  • Leverages our existing core competencies
  • Sustains our competitive advantage
  • Expands our inclusivity and strengthens sense of community, partnership and commonality
  • We will need curricula development activity
Cal Poly will build on its core learn-by-doing pedagogy to ensure all students have a comprehensive polytechnic multi-mode education that could include project-based, cross-disciplinary, co-curricular, multi-mode, experiential and international opportunities.

- Increases our institutional differentiation
- Leverages our existing core competencies
- Sustains our competitive advantage
- We will need curricula development activity
- We may need review of all programs and course offerings

Cal Poly will shift the mix of students to increase the proportion of graduate students and international students while maintaining the quality and polytechnic identity of our graduates.

- Increases our cultural diversity, increases heterogeneity
- Elevates our academic scholarly climate
- Improves our economic viability
- We will need expansion of recruitment strategies and support services
- We may need curricula development activity
- We will need review of all programs and course offerings
- Offsets anticipated declining in-state K12 pool that is STEM-ready
- Enhances global perspectives

Cal Poly will restore institutional economic viability by strategically managing revenue, costs and allocation of resources, improving effectiveness and efficiency, while maintaining quality.

- Improves our economic viability
- Sustains our competitive advantage
- We will need comprehensive management of enrollment, retention, progress and graduation, costs, and review of curricula to optimize course offerings
- Expand the number and amount of revenue streams such as more effective use of summer quarter, on-line STEM curricula for P12 teachers, etc.
- We will need strengthened relationships with our external partners and stakeholders

Cal Poly will adopt and implement comprehensive enrollment management.

- Will improve alignment and match of student to appropriate program choices
- Will remove all institutional barriers to timely graduation
- Will improve retention, progress-to-degree, and graduation rates, and providing value to each student by reducing their total cost
- Will improve ability to plan course offerings, optimize schedules, and use of faculty time
- Will need comprehensive review of curricula
Cal Poly will adopt and implement institution-wide vision-driven and evidence-based decision making and continuous improvement processes.

- Improves our economic viability by identifying opportunities to reduce costs, improve effectiveness and efficiencies
- Continually reallocate resources to the most effective methods of increasing enrollment, retention, progress and graduation
- Can increase agility by decreasing elapsed time for decision-making and implementation
- Align budgets and other resources to desired achievement of mission and vision

**ACTION PLANS AND INITIATIVES**

All divisions and colleges will develop plans linked to this institutional plan and its strategic decisions. Those plans will be tied to the institutional Mission and Vision statements identifying the contributions and roles, and highlight opportunities for collaboration and partnering. The plans will encompass the stakeholder perspectives, incorporate Cal Poly values and use the institutional key performance indicators along with other metrics that are specifically appropriate. Plans, progress, initiatives and opportunities would be reviewed annually. Note that all the plans combined together with this institutional plan will form the foundation for planning the next Cal Poly capital campaign.

Cal Poly is developing its second comprehensive campaign. Extensive planning for the campaign has positioned the university advancement team to begin fundraising for the campaign in July 2010. The priorities of the campaign are in alignment with the Cal Poly Strategic Plan and include:

- Sustainable and Healthy Communities
- Learn by Doing and the 21st Century Polytechnic Experience
- Innovation/Leadership/Entrepreneurship

Core campus-wide fundraising priorities include:

*Faculty Support*: Endowed faculty positions and other faculty support mechanisms will allow Cal Poly to attract and retain the highest quality faculty in their fields and to grow existing and new centers of excellence on campus.

*Academic Programmatic Support*: Cal Poly’s evolving curriculum demonstrates the university’s emerging commitment to cross-disciplinary learning opportunities and newly emerging fields of study. Innovative curriculum and academic centers require investments in program development to maximize the intellectual capital generated throughout the academic community. Private support will augment state funding to develop leading-edge programming and ensure access to challenging learning opportunities.

*Student Support*: The ability to attract and retain quality students and to provide an enriched academic learning environment will help strengthen the student experience and enhance the prestige of a Cal Poly degree. This support takes the form of scholarships,
project-based learning support, student/faculty research projects, graduate fellowships, and service learning opportunities.

Facilities/Capital Investment/Technology Support: Private support, whether solely funded or augmented with state funds, will provide critical space for students and faculty to enjoy an innovative learning and teaching environment through new construction, renovation, laboratory modernization, and information infrastructure enhancements designed to enhance student life.

Common Goods: Some activities and facilities on campus are designed to serve the whole university – all colleges, students, faculty, and staff. Without acknowledgement, they tend to be “orphans” with no direct constituency. The campaign will specifically identify them and build a fund-raising strategy around them.
### Table 1: CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATIONS

Shown for Four-year institutions only. Carnegie used 2003-2004 degree and enrollment data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION TYPES</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Subcategories</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>CP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Doctoral degrees &gt;20/yr</td>
<td>Research University - Very High Research Activity</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Doctoral degrees &lt;20/yr &amp; Masters degrees &gt;50/yr</td>
<td>Larger Masters degrees &gt;200/yr</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>Doctoral degrees &lt;20/yr &amp; Masters degrees &lt;50/yr</td>
<td>Medium Masters degrees 100-199/yr</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smaller Masters degrees 50-99/yr</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE &amp; SETTING</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Large 10,000+</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium 3,000-9,999</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small 1,000-2,999</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Small 0-999</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>% On-campus Residential (R) &amp; % Part-time (PT)</td>
<td>Highly Residential R&gt;50% &amp; FT&gt;80%</td>
<td>609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily Residential R=25-49%</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily Non-Residential R&lt;25% or PT&gt;50%</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENROLLMENT PROFILE</td>
<td>% Graduate &amp; Professional program students (G&amp;P)</td>
<td>Shown for institutions with student body of baccalaureate and graduate students only.</td>
<td>Very High UG G&amp;P=0-9%</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High UG 10-24%</td>
<td>526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority UG 25-49%</td>
<td>301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority G&amp;P 50-100%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE PROFILE</td>
<td>% Part-time</td>
<td>Shown for only 1543 institutions with PT&lt;40%</td>
<td>PT&gt;40%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selectivity</td>
<td>Freshmen scores. Includes only 1543 institutions with PT&lt;40%</td>
<td>More Selective Top fifth</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selective Middle two-fifths</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive -</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Transfer in</td>
<td>Includes only the 1116 Selective and</td>
<td>Low 0-20%</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION PROGRAM</td>
<td>More Selective Institutions</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences (A&amp;S), and Professions (P)</td>
<td>Relative proportion of A&amp;S and P</td>
<td>A&amp;S-Focus P=0-19%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;S+P P=20-39%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balanced P=40-59%</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P=A&amp;S P=60-79%</td>
<td>501 CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P-Focus P=80-100%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Program Coexistence</td>
<td>% graduate degrees awarded in fields corresponding to UG majors</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>0-49%</td>
<td>823 CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>50%+</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADUATE INSTRUCTION PROGRAM</th>
<th>Single Program</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Doctoral Program and degree awarded [1213 institutions]</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant - plurality in:</td>
<td>Hum &amp; SS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive - degrees in each of Hum, Soc Sci, STEM, &amp; Professional fields</td>
<td>With Med/Vet</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Med/Vet</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without Doctoral Program or degree awarded [804 institutions]</th>
<th>Single Program</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>158</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant - plurality in:</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comprehensive - degrees in each of Hum, Soc Sci, STEM, & Professional fields | 104 CP |
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Table 2: DEGREES, MAJORS, PROGRAMS & EFFORT by CARNEGIE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC FIELD GROUPINGS</th>
<th>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</th>
<th>PROFESSIONS</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>OTHER PROFESSIONS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONS + STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences (incl Liberal Studies &amp; Economics)</td>
<td>26% Degrees</td>
<td>74% Degrees</td>
<td>16% Degrees</td>
<td>84% Degrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Mathematics (incl Earth Sciences)</td>
<td>25% Majors</td>
<td>75% Majors</td>
<td>14% Majors</td>
<td>86% Majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences</td>
<td>35% Programs</td>
<td>65% Programs</td>
<td>19% Programs</td>
<td>43% Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Technology</td>
<td>53% Programs</td>
<td>47% Effort</td>
<td>31% Programs</td>
<td>40% Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40% Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29% Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development, Early Childhood, Interdiscipl. Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 3: COLLEGES by CARNEGIE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Fields</th>
<th>Humanities &amp; Social Sciences</th>
<th>Sciences &amp; Mathematics (and Earth Sciences)</th>
<th>Computer Sciences</th>
<th>Engineering, Technology</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Accounting, Business Admin</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Child Dev, Creative Comm, Graphic Des, Journalism, Public Policy</th>
<th>Other Professions</th>
<th>H+SS</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>Other Professions</th>
<th>H+SS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONS + STEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>CSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>COLLEGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>College of Architecture and Environmental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>College of Science and Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>Orfalea College of Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Rachel Fernflores  
Chair, Academic Senate  

From: Jeffrey D. Armstrong  
President  

Date: June 28, 2011  

Copies R. Koob, P. Bailey,  
D. Christy, L. Halisky,  
T. Jones, E. Smith,  
D. Wehner  

Subject  
Response to Academic Senate Resolution AS-728-11  
Resolution on The Strategic Plan  

This memo formally acknowledges receipt of the above-entitled Academic Senate resolution.  

Please convey my appreciation to the committee members for their attention to this important matter.
Discussion Item

Definition of Membership of the General Faculty in the Constitution of the Faculty

ARTICLE I. MEMBERSHIP OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

Voting members of the General Faculty of Cal Poly shall consist of those persons who are employed at Cal Poly and belong to at least one of the following entities: (1) full-time academic employees holding faculty rank whose principal duty is within an academic department, unit, or program; (2) faculty members in the Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base Program; (3) full-time probationary and/or permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services as defined in Article III.1.b of this constitution; (4) full-time coaches holding a current faculty appointment of at least one year; (5) lecturers holding full-time appointments of at least one year in one or more academic departments, units, or programs; or (6) lecturers with a current assignment of 15 WTUs for at least three consecutive quarters.

Voting members of the General Faculty of Cal Poly shall consist of those persons who are employed at Cal Poly and belong to at least one of the following entities:

(1) full-time or part-time (PRTBs, FERPs, and faculty with reduction in time base) tenured/tenure-track instructional faculty

(2) lecturers holding full-time appointments of at least one year, or who have had three consecutive quarters with an assignment appointment of 15 WTUs per quarter;

(3) part-time lecturers holding appointments for at least six consecutive years;

(4) full-time or part-time (including PRTBs, FERPs, and faculty with reduction in time base) tenured/tenure-track counselors or library faculty unit employees;

(5) full-time or part-time probationary and/or permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services (PCS) which include (a) librarians; (b) counselors (SSP: SSP-ARI, SSP-ARII, and SSP-ARIII); (a) student services professionals (SSPs III and IV); and (b) physicians;

(6) full-time temporary employees in PCS holding appointments of at least one year which include (a) librarians; (b) counselors (SSP: SSP-ARI, SSP-ARII, and SSP-ARIII); (c) student services professionals (SSPs III and IV); (d) physicians; and (e) coaches; holding appointments of at least 12 consecutive months;

(7) part-time temporary employees in PCS holding current employment of at least six consecutive years which include (a) librarians; (b) counselors (SSP: SSP-ARI, SSP-ARII, and SSP-ARIII); (c) student services professionals (SSPs III and IV); (d) physicians; and (e) coaches; and holding appointments for at least six consecutive years;

(8) faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP);

Members of the General Faculty, including department chairs/heads, shall not cease to be members because of any assigned time allotted to them for the carrying out of duties consistent with their employment at Cal Poly. "Visiting Personnel," visiting faculty, and volunteer instructors shall not be members of the General Faculty. Members of the General Faculty who are on leave for at least one year shall not be voting members during their leave.

Nonvoting membership in the General Faculty shall consist of all academic personnel not included in the voting membership.
ARTICLE III
THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Section I. Membership

(a) Colleges with fewer than 30 faculty members (full-time lecturers and tenured/tenure-track instructional faculty) shall elect two senators. All other colleges shall elect three senators, plus one additional senator for each additional 30 faculty members or major fraction thereof.¹

(b) Designated personnel in Professional Consultative Services (excepting directors) as defined in Article I. Section 4-6 will follow the same formula for representation as used by the colleges (Article III, Section 1 (a)) shall be represented in the Academic Senate by the formula of one senator per each fifteen members or major fraction thereof:²

(1) Full time probationary or permanent Librarians; and
(2) Full time probationary or permanent (a) counselors; (b) student services professionals [SSP]; SSP I academically related, SSP II academically related, and SSP III academically related; (c) SSPs III and IV; (d) Cooperative Education lecturers; and (e) physicians.
(3) Full time coaches holding a current faculty appointment of at least one year.

(c) Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and part-time student services professionals (SSPs III and IV); physicians; and coaches; employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I, will be represented by one voting member in the Senate.

(d) Senators acting in an at-large capacity are the current Academic Senate Chair, the immediate Past Academic Senate Chair, and the CSU academic senators. All at-large positions shall be voting positions except for the Academic Senate Chair which is a nonvoting position except when the Chair’s vote is needed to break a tie.

(e) Elected senators and officers must be voting members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I with an appointment for their term of service.

(f) Ex officio, nonvoting members are (1) the President of the University or designee, (2) the Provost or designee, (3) one representative from among the academic deans, (4) the ASI President, (5) the Chair of ASI Board of Directors, and (6) the Vice President for Student Affairs.

¹ All calculations are based on employment data from October of the academic year of the election.
² All calculations are based on employment data from October of the academic year of the election.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Current Description</th>
<th>Proposed Description</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1) Full-time academic employees holding faculty rank whose principal duty is within an academic department, unit, or program  2) Faculty members in the Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base Program</td>
<td>1) Full-time or part-time (PRTB, FERP, and faculty with reduction in time base) tenured/tenure-track instructional faculty</td>
<td>Include faculty on reduced time base (FERP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3) Full-time probationary and/or permanent employees in Professional Consultative Services as defined in Article III.1.b of this constitution</td>
<td>4) Full-time or part-time (PRTB, FERP, and faculty with reduction in time base) tenured/tenure-track counselors or library faculty unit employees  5) Full-time or part-time probationary and/or permanent employees in (a) student services professionals (SSPs III and IV); and b) physicians  6) Full-time temporary: a) librarians; b) counselors (SSP-ARI, SSP-ARII, SSP-ARIII); c) student services professionals (SSPs III and IV); d) physicians; and e) coaches holding appointments of at least 12 consecutive months</td>
<td>Include temporary members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4) Full-time coaches holding a current faculty appointment of at least one year</td>
<td>6) Full-time temporary: a) librarians; b) counselors (SSP-ARI, SSP-ARII, SSP-ARIII); c) student services professionals (SSPs III and IV); d) physicians; and e) coaches; holding appointments of at least 12 consecutive months</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5) Lecturers holding full-time appointments of at least one year in one or more academic departments, units, or programs  6) Lecturers with a current assignment of 15 WTUs for at least three consecutive quarters</td>
<td>2) Lecturers holding full-time appointments of at least one year, or who have had three consecutive quarters with an appointment of 15 WTUs per quarter</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Part-time lecturers holding appointments for at least six consecutive years</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>7) Part-time temporary: a) librarians; b) counselors (SSP-ARI, SSP-ARII, SSP-ARIII); c) student services professionals (SSPs III and IV); d) physicians; e) coaches; holding appointments for at least six consecutive years</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Membership of the General Faculty

### Formula for calculating representation (02.11.16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL FACULTY</strong></td>
<td><strong>GENERAL FACULTY and PCS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &lt;30</td>
<td>2 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &gt;30</td>
<td>3 senators PLUS 1 for every 30 or major fraction thereof (50% + 1 = 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 46</td>
<td>4 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 - 76</td>
<td>5 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 - 106</td>
<td>6 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 - 136</td>
<td>7 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137 - 166</td>
<td>8 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 - 196</td>
<td>9 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197 - 226</td>
<td>10 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PCS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 for every 15 or major fraction thereof (50% = 1 = 8)</td>
<td>1 for every 15 or major fraction thereof (50% = 1 = 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>1 senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 38</td>
<td>2 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - 53</td>
<td>3 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 - 68</td>
<td>4 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 - 83</td>
<td>5 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 - 98</td>
<td>6 senators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 - 113</td>
<td>7 senators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes from formula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FULL-TIME FACULTY /PCS
FOR ACADEMIC SENATE ELECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>2016-2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of faculty</td>
<td># of positions</td>
<td># of vacancies</td>
<td># of faculty</td>
<td># of positions</td>
<td># of vacancies</td>
<td># of faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAED</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCOB</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENG</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>184**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One of the senators' term shall be for one year

**Should have been 9 positions but due to timeframe & error in previous year it was decided to leave as it to avoid confusion.
BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SPRING 2015

II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
B. TERMS OF OFFICE
1. Terms of office for senators: the elected term of office for senators shall be a two-year term or one-year term when the caucus membership changes by more than two representatives. A senator can serve a maximum of two consecutive, elected terms. A senator can serve a maximum of four consecutive years and shall not again be eligible for election until one year has elapsed. A senator appointed to fill a temporary vacancy for an elected position shall serve until the completion of that term or until the senator being temporarily replaced returns, whichever occurs first. If this temporary appointment is for one year or less or if the senator is serving a one-year elected term, it shall not be counted as part of the two-term four years maximum for elected senators. The representative for part-time academic employees shall serve a one-year term with a maximum of four consecutive one-year terms.

2. Terms of office for Academic Senate Chair: once a senator is elected to serve as Academic Senate chair, that senator becomes an at-large member of the Academic Senate and the position vacated becomes a college vacancy to be filled by the college caucus. The elected term of office for Academic Senate Chair shall be a maximum of three one-year consecutive terms.

C. REPRESENTATION
1. Colleges and Professional Consultative Services with an even number of senators shall elect one-half of their senators each year. Those with an odd number of senators shall not deviate from electing one-half of their senators each year by more than one senator. All of the senators from each college and Professional Consultative Services shall constitute the appropriate caucus.

2. When a college or Professional Consultative Services with an uneven number of senators gains a new senator due to an increase in faculty in a year when more than one-half of their senators are to be elected, the new Senate position shall be for one year for the first year, then two years thereafter.

3. There shall be no more than one senator per department/teaching area elected by any college where applicable until all departments/teaching areas within that college are represented. A department/teaching area shall waive its right to representation by failure to nominate. This bylaw shall have precedence over Article III.B of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate.
To: Gary Laver, Chair, Academic Senate  
From: Dustin Stegner, Chair, Instruction Committee  
Subject: Recommendations for Academic Calendar, 2017-18  
Date: November 3, 2015  

The Academic Senate Instruction Committee met to discuss the proposed options for the 2017-18 academic calendar. The only feedback received about the 2017-18 calendar was from AFD. One AFD manager indicated that the mid-week start times violates CAP. However, since CAP 211.11 reads, “Whenever possible, the first day of instruction each quarter shall be a Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum spring quarter) and the last day of instruction each quarter shall be a Friday.” The current options are not adhering closely to the “whenever possible,” but CAP does provide leeway here.

The committee thus recommends the following options:

- Summer 2017: Option 1 – No other options were provided
- Fall 2017: Option 1 – This option allows for an optional common final time. The rationale for this recommendation is that the common final time currently conflicts with the final examination times for evening and night courses. Since the Saturday common final time is optional, programs would have the discretion whether to implement it.
- Winter 2018: Option 1 – Please see the rationale for Fall 2017.
- Spring 2018: Option – Please see the rationale for Fall 2017

In addition to the official calendar options provided by the Registrar’s Office, the committee discussed two issues.

First, at the request of an academic senator, the committee was asked to solicit feedback on the decision to move to a week-long Thanksgiving Holiday (rather than the Wednesday-Friday holiday that is in place for the 2015-16 academic calendar). The feedback from across the university was very mixed—but one of the themes that emerged from it was that the Thanksgiving holiday is disruptive to instruction because week 11 and the finals examination period are separated by the holiday break.

Second, the committee asked for comment across the different colleges about the possibility of an earlier start time to the fall quarter so that the quarter would end the Friday before Thanksgiving. This would solve the problem of the Thanksgiving holiday disruption and create a more substantial winter break for students, especially out-of-state and international students, to return home and for faculty to prepare for the winter and spring quarters. This is an issue that has been discussed in the past, but has not been formally pursued.
Summer Quarter 2017

Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:
- Per CAP 211.1, "Summer quarter should end prior to Labor Day. Spring quarter should end prior to the second weekend in June."
- Per CAP 211.1, "The need to start the first day of instruction on a Monday shall take higher priority in planning the academic calendar than ending summer quarter prior to Labor Day and ending spring quarter prior to the second week in June."
- Per CAP 211.2, "Whenever possible, quarter breaks should include no less than 5 calendar days between the last day of final examinations and the beginning of the subsequent quarter."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2017</th>
<th>Break between Spring and Summer terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Option 1    | 3 business days                      | June 22, Thursday   | July 4, Tuesday | *10-week session: August 29, Tuesday | August 30 - September 1, W - F, for a 10-week session | In order for the Summer term to end prior to Labor Day:  
  - There is a break of 3 business days between spring and summer terms.  
  - Final examination period is shortened to 3 days, Wednesday-Friday, August 30 - September 1, for a 10-week session.  
  Instructional Days = 48 |

* For reference, dates have been provided for a 10-week session, the longest session in a term. Actual sessions to be offered during the summer term will be determined at a later date.

Legend:
- Academic Holiday
- First Day of Classes
- Final Exams
- Commencement
Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:

- Per CAP 211.1, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction each quarter shall be a Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum spring quarter) and the last day of instruction each quarter shall be a Friday."
- Per CAP 211.1, "In calendar years in which the first Monday of the quarter falls on a major religious or cultural holiday, it is recommended that instruction shall begin on Tuesday of that week."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Break between Summer and Fall terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Break between Fall and Winter terms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Labor Day holiday plus 2 business days</td>
<td>Fall Conference starts Sept. 7, Thursday</td>
<td>November 10, Friday</td>
<td>December 1, Friday</td>
<td>December 2, Saturday Common Finals Option</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>There is no major religious or cultural holiday on the first day of classes. Between summer and fall, there is a break of 2 business days plus the Labor Day holiday. Between fall and winter, there is a break of 4 weeks. <strong>Saturday common finals option</strong> Instructional Days = 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Labor Day holiday plus 2 business days</td>
<td>Fall Conference starts Sept. 7, Thursday</td>
<td>November 10, Friday</td>
<td>December 1, Friday</td>
<td>December 4-8, M - F</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>There is no major religious or cultural holiday on the first day of classes. Between summer and fall, there is a break of 2 business days plus the Labor Day holiday. Between fall and winter, there is a break of 4 weeks. <strong>No Saturday common finals</strong> Instructional Days = 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Winter Quarter 2018

Campus Administrative Policy for consideration:

- Per CAP 211.1, "Whenever possible, each academic quarter shall consist of a minimum of nine (9) offerings of calendar days' schedules." For example, there should be nine offerings of Monday classes, nine offerings of Tuesday classes, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter 2018</th>
<th>Break between Fall and Winter terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Option 1** | 3 or 4 weeks (depending on Fall option) | January 8, Monday | January 15, Monday | March 16, Friday | March 17, Saturday Common Finals March 19 - 23, M - F | Option is to follow a Monday schedule on another day of the week, so there are nine offerings of Monday classes during the term. Saturday common finals option Follow a Monday schedule on Tuesday, February 20, following the President's Day holiday on Monday, February 19. Considerations:  
  * Can affect part-time faculty with other jobs off-campus (e.g. at Cuesta) and students' jobs off-campus.*  
  * Occurrence later in term may affect mid-term schedules.*  
  Note: Cesar Chavez Day on March 31 occurs during the spring break. Instructional Days = 48 |
| **Option 2** | 3 or 4 weeks (depending on Fall option) | January 8, Monday | January 15, Monday | March 16, Friday | March 19 - 23, M - F | Option is to follow a Monday schedule on another day of the week, so there are nine offerings of Monday classes during the term. No Saturday common finals Follow a Monday schedule on Tuesday, February 20, following the President's Day holiday on Monday, February 19. Considerations:  
  * Can affect part-time faculty with other jobs off-campus (e.g. at Cuesta) and students' jobs off-campus.*  
  * Occurrence later in term may affect mid-term schedules.*  
  Note: Cesar Chavez Day on March 31 occurs during the spring break. Instructional Days = 48 |
Spring Quarter 2018

Campus Administrative Policy to consider:

- Per CAP 211.1, "Whenever possible, the first day of instruction each quarter shall be a Monday with a 48-day minimum per quarter (49-day minimum spring quarter) and the last day of instruction each quarter shall be a Friday. In calendar years in which the first Monday of the quarter falls on Cesar Chavez Day, instruction shall begin on Tuesday of that week."

- Per CAP 211.1, "Summer quarter should end prior to Labor Day. Spring quarter should end prior to the second weekend in June."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
<th>Break between Winter and Spring terms</th>
<th>First Day of Classes</th>
<th>Academic Holiday</th>
<th>Last Day of Classes</th>
<th>Final Exam Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>April 2, Monday</td>
<td>May 28, Monday</td>
<td>June 8, Friday</td>
<td>June 9, Saturday Common Finals&lt;br&gt;June 11 - 15, M - F</td>
<td>To avoid having three Monday holidays in the same term, the Winter 2018 term starts the week of January 8 – the week after the January 1 holiday, which would be observed on Monday, January 1. As a result, the Spring term starts later and doesn’t end until the third weekend in June. Saturday common finals option&lt;br&gt;Instructional Days = 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>April 2, Monday</td>
<td>May 28, Monday</td>
<td>June 8, Friday</td>
<td>June 11 - 15, M - F</td>
<td>To avoid having three Monday holidays in the same term, the Winter 2018 term starts the week of January 8 – the week after the January 1 holiday, which would be observed on Monday, January 1. As a result, the Spring term starts later and doesn’t end until the third weekend in June. No Saturday common finals&lt;br&gt;Instructional Days = 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Year/Term</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF Days</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR Days</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Instructional Days</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exams</td>
<td>TBD†</td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Academic Work Days</td>
<td>48†</td>
<td>62 or 63</td>
<td>53 or 54</td>
<td>55 or 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Academic Year Instructional Days (F-W-Sp) = 148
Total Academic Year Work Days (F-W-Sp) = 170 or 173

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

* Fall Conference
† Final exam periods for summer term are determined by the number and length of sessions offered.
‡ Spring commencement occurs over the course of 2 days with departments participating in 1 of those days.
Calendar for August–December 2017 (United States)

Holidays and Observances:

- Sep 4 Labor Day
- Oct 31 Halloween
- Nov 23 Thanksgiving Day
- Dec 25 Christmas Day
- Oct 8 Columbus Day (Most regions)
- Nov 11 Veterans Day
- Dec 24 Christmas Eve
- Dec 31 New Year's Eve

Calendar generated on www.timeanddate.com/calendar

Calendar for August–December 2018 (United States)

Holidays and Observances:

- Sep 3 Labor Day
- Oct 31 Halloween
- Nov 22 Thanksgiving Day
- Dec 25 Christmas Day
- Oct 8 Columbus Day (Most regions)
- Nov 11 Veterans Day
- Dec 24 Christmas Eve
- Dec 31 New Year's Eve

Calendar generated on www.timeanddate.com/calendar