Minutes of the
Academic Senate Meeting
Tuesday, February 10, 2015
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00pm

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the Academic Senate minutes from January 13, 2015.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): Laver spoke on the first installment of the agreement with the Vice President for Administration and Finance office to have a list sent over every year with the number of MPPs there are on campus.

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: none.
   B. President’s Office: none.
   C. Provost: none.
   D. Vice President for Student Affairs (Humphrey):
      - Attending CSU system Title IX training today and Wednesday, where many of Cal Poly’s education and response efforts are being highlighted as best practices for all campuses to adopt.
      - Conversations continue with the leadership of fraternities and sororities around the current social probation, and the need for our students to develop an actionable plan that outlines education efforts and immediate and long term steps to improve party management practices.
      - The Health Center is reaching capacity every day close to 2pm, so please encourage students who want to be seen to come early. Students who arrive after capacity has been reached with major concerns are still able to be seen after hours.
      - Dr. Tim Archie, a Cal Poly alum, has been appointed Student Affairs first Director of Assessment and Research. Dr. Archie will help measure the impact of student affairs programs and services on academic performance, persistence and graduation along with program specific learning outcomes. He will also participate in data analysis for key institutional priorities like WASC and the Master Plan Update. Dr. Archie begins in late March.
   E. Statewide Senate (Foroohar/LoCascio): Foroohar reported on the resolutions from the statewide meetings last month. The first resolution asks the Chancellor’s Office to look at the academic freedom policy from 1971 and revise it. Another resolution that was passed unanimously asks the campus Senates to look at policy and encourage part time faculty to take part in shared governance. HR reported that recruitment numbers are up, but the density of tenure track faculty is still dropping. LoCascio reported on his meetings where they discussed community college offering bachelor’s degrees, what the definition of an upper division GE course is, and decided that if California adopts Common Core, the minimum requirement to enter the CSU is the minimum requirement to graduate high school, which requires intermediate algebra.
   F. CFA Campus President: none.
   G. ASI Representative (Sullivan): The Board of Trustees approved the Student Involvement and Representation Fee, which requires students to pay a voluntary four
dollar fee to fund the CSSA unless they go through the process to opt out. At the last Board of Directors meeting, the Board passed a proposal to put aside a sizable amount of money toward a weeklong event on sexual assault and prevention.

IV. Consent Agenda:
All items listed in the following link were approved by consensus:
http://registrar.calpoly.edu/summaries-2015-17-catalog-changes

V. Special Reports:
A. New Registration Rotation System: Cem Sunata, Registrar, spoke on the process of how the new registration system works. His presentation can be found at: http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/acadsen_comm_reports/yearend14-15/New%20Registration%20Rotation%20System.pdf

VI. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Exceptions to Scheduling Class Time Conflicts: Dustin Stegner, chair of the Instruction Committee, spoke on a resolution that develops policy on how the Office of Registrar handles exceptions to scheduling class time conflicts. The resolution was discussed and will return as a second reading.

VII. Discussion Item(s):
The proposal on making ARCH 131/132/133 count as GE D4 was discussed. Both Michael Lucas, College of Architecture and Environmental Design’s Associate Dean, and Brenda Helmbrecht, chair of the General Education Governance Board, spoke on behalf of their respective sides of the proposal. The Academic Senate Curriculum Appeals Committee will discuss the information provided and will submit a decision to approve, disapprove, or return the items to committee.

VIII. Adjournment: 5:08 pm

Submitted by,

[Signature]

Alex Ye
Academic Senate Student Assistant
We need to demonstrate continued progress on issues cited in the visiting team’s EER report:

- Assessment of undergraduate learning outcomes
- Diversity
  - Demographics: faculty, staff, and students
  - Campus climate
  - Effectiveness of student success initiatives (e.g., change of major policies, AP/DQ, EAP)
Total Faculty Tenure Status
(% of paid FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Non-Tenure</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Others refer to non-tenure track eligible and non-Bargaining Unit 3 instructors (e.g., administrators, coaches, librarians, volunteers, etc.)
Total Faculty Profile by Ethnic Origin
(excluding white; % Head Count)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Multi-Racial</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien</th>
<th>Unknown/Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Student Enrollment Profile by Ethnic Origin (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Other</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Enrollment Profile by URM (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>URM (%)</th>
<th>Non-URM (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cal Poly 6-Year Graduation Rates by College by Cohort Matriculation Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matriculation Term</th>
<th>Total University</th>
<th>CAFES</th>
<th>CAED</th>
<th>CENG</th>
<th>CLA</th>
<th>OCOB</th>
<th>CSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Graduated within Six Years

- Total University
- CAFES
- CAED
- CENG
- CLA
- OCOB
- CSM
6-Year Graduation Rates: URM vs Non-URM by Cohort Matriculation Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matriculation Term</th>
<th>Total University</th>
<th>URM*</th>
<th>Non-URM</th>
<th>URM Graduation Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graduation Gap: the difference in graduation rates between URM and Non-URM students.

*Under-represented minorities: Hispanic, Native American, and Black
• Campus leadership and assessment policy

• Indirect assessment: 2013-14 NSSE

• Direct assessment:
  – Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
  – University/GE Assessment Plan
• Nationally administered test of critical thinking skills

• CSU requirement: CP administers annually since 2007-08

• Value added based on comparison of freshman and senior performance

• CP seniors perform “above,” “at,” or “near” expected every year except 2012-13, when they perform “below”
If you are interested in seeing the entire report go to Academic Programs website:  
*(report posted by Tuesday, February 10, 2015)*  
http://www.academicprograms.calpoly.edu/

If you would like to comment, please send to wasc@calpoly.edu
CURRENT SYSTEM

- It was developed due to the inherent flaw of the “traditional” system of standing-based registration
- Undergraduate students are divided into 12 alphabetical groups
- Each group is further divided into 6 subgroups
- An algorithm places these groups and subgroups into the rotation regardless of class standing or degree progress
- Students are given 3 priorities to use during their senior year
REGISTRATION & SCHEDULING COMMITTEE

Committee Membership

- College of Agriculture, Food, & Environmental Sciences
- College of Architecture & Environmental Design
- Orfalea College of Business
- College of Engineering
- College of Liberal Arts
- College of Science & Mathematics
- Associated Students, Inc. (2 members)
- Instructional Department Heads Council
- Student Affairs
- Information Technology Services
- Administration & Finance
- Office of the Provost
- Office of the President
- Office of the Registrar

- Appointed by the President and reports to the Provost or designee
- Charged with evaluation of procedures, policies, and guidelines used in registration and scheduling of classes
- Recommends changes to existing procedures
- Evaluates and recommends new concepts in registration and scheduling
Movie!

http://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/registrar/1/registration/EAP/registrationpromo.mp4
NEW SYSTEM

• Based on degree progress as defined in the Expected Academic Progress policy established in 2010
• 4 Academic Progress Levels
  – Level IV (75.1% - 100%)
  – Level III (45.1% - 75%)
  – Level II (20.1% - 45%)
  – Level I (0% - 20%)
• Students progress through the levels by completing degree applicable courses
New Registration Appointment Categories
(By order of registration)

Special Exceptions

New and Continuing Graduate Students

Graduating Seniors

Priority Choice Registration*

Academic Progress Level IV (75.1%-100%) 
Academic Progress Level III (45.1%-75%) 
Academic Progress Level II (20.1%-45%) 
Academic Progress Level I (0%-20%) 
PolyPlanner Non-Compliant Student

* Expires as of Fall 2016

NEW SYSTEM

• Students’ existing priorities are valid through Summer 2016
• Stopped assigning the 3 priorities to incoming freshmen as of Fall 2014
• Introduced a new category of “graduating seniors” as of Spring 2014
  – Assigned to student once their expected graduation term is set
  – Can only be used once during Cal Poly career
  – Students can postpone its use if planning to change the graduation term
FINAL NOTES ABOUT THE NEW SYSTEM

• A much more accurate version of the most widely used registration system in the country

• Students at the same academic progress level “compete” for the classes of that level
  – A student of a certain cohort who falls behind in academic progress will not have the rest of his cohort as “competition”
  – If a second year class is being filled by students at Level III (45-75%, or in their third year), there is a deeper problem

• Degree progress is calculated once a quarter (at census date), which determines students’ level for the upcoming registration later that same quarter
  – Any academic paperwork needs to be filed by the last day of instruction of the previous quarter in order to influence the next registration cycle

• Neither the old nor the new system will fix the issue of availability of classes
  – Degree flowcharts
  – PolyPlanner
  – Clear communication of needs at department and college level