I. Minutes: none.

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

III. Regular Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President's Office:
C. Provost:
D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
E. Statewide Senate:
F. CFA Campus President:
G. ASI Representative:
H. Committee Chair(s):

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2010-2011.

B. Resolution on Campus Wide Change of Major Policy: Hannings, chair of Curriculum Committee, second reading (pp. 2-6).

C. Resolution on Selection Process for the Nomination of Faculty Representatives to the Advisory Committee for the Selection of Campus President: Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 7-11).

D. Resolution on Addition to Academic Senate Bylaws of the Academic Senate to Include Process for First and Second Readings: Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 12-13).

VI. Special Report(s):

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment:
RESOLUTION ON CAMPUS WIDE CHANGE OF MAJOR POLICY

WHEREAS, Cal Poly requires students to declare their major at their time of application; and

WHEREAS, Approximately thirty percent of Cal Poly students change their major during their time at Cal Poly; and

WHEREAS, Changing majors can increase a student’s time to degree; and

WHEREAS, Senate Resolution AS-582-02/IC, Resolution on Process for Change of Major, adopted March, 2002, was never fully implemented; and

WHEREAS, The process and rules for change of major are set by each department and are inconsistent across the campus, and in some cases they are unclear or onerous; and

WHEREAS, Student success is our primary goal; and

WHEREAS, The attached Change of Major Policy has been created with input from a committee of the associate deans, the Senate Curriculum Committee, and the faculty at an open forum; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the attached Change of Major Policy; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to President Baker that the campus adopt the attached Change of Major Policy.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee
Date: January 14 2010
Revised: January 24 2010
Revised: March 2 2010
CHANGE OF MAJOR POLICY
January 24, 2010

Policy Statement

Cal Poly students are required to declare a major at the time of application. Some students find that their interests and abilities lead them in a different direction. The university must offer a transparent and timely process for all students who seek to change majors.

Process

I. General Guidelines

A. Minimum Time at Cal Poly
   Students must complete at least one quarter at Cal Poly before requesting a change of major.

B. Basic Criteria that may be used in advising for determining Target Major Options
   All academic departments should give careful consideration when determining target major options. The following criteria may be considered:

   1. The majors for which the student was eligible at time of admission,
   2. College academic record (e.g., GPA, coursework, etc.), and
   3. Remaining coursework and the student’s ability to complete degree requirements in the new major within the published unit maximums for that major.

C. One Chance to be Accepted
   Students who enter into an individualized change of major agreement (ICMA) and do not complete the ICMA requirements will not be eligible to request that major again later in their career at Cal Poly.

D. Completion of Change of Major
   The change of major will be approved once the student has successfully met all of the requirements of the ICMA.

E. Timeframe
   The ICMA must be feasible to complete and be completed in no more than two quarters.

F. Publication of Change of Major Criteria
   As applicable, department’s web sites should post the minimum criteria required of all students to change major into their program including timelines.
G. *Impaction Constraints*
Per the Office of the Chancellor’s *The California State University Enrollment Management Policy and Practices*, other admissions requirements for all transfer students (internal and external) entering the target majors on impacted campuses must be the same (e.g., portfolios, auditions, etc.).

H. *Academic Standing*
A change of major agreement will be void if a student is academically disqualified prior to the completion of the agreement.

II. **Requesting a Change of Major**

A. Meet with current adviser to review major options and talk about career paths. Consider, also, consulting with Career Services, other advisers, and faculty and/or department heads/chairs in both current and target majors.

B. Meet with the department head/chair or designee in the target major to determine the likelihood of success in the new major.

C. Review the curriculum requirements for the target major.

D. If the target major is not a good fit for the student, the student will be advised to look at other options.

E. If the student receives a positive assessment based on consideration of I.B., and it is clear that they can complete degree requirements in the new major within the unit maximum (unit maximum is 24 units above program requirements), then an ICMA will be developed (see below).

III. **Individualized Change of Major Agreement (ICMA)**

The change of major will be approved once the student has successfully met all of the requirements of the ICMA.

The ICMA will cover no more than two quarters. The ICMA may include the following components:

A. Maximum of three specified courses or 12 units in the target major.

B. Additional courses and/or units to allow the student to meet minimum progress standards and complete degree applicable units in both majors, whenever possible (e.g., GE courses or electives a student could use to meet degree requirements in both current and target majors).

C. GPA requirements, as determined by the department (e.g., overall/term GPA, GPA in major-specified courses, GPA in past two quarters).
D. If applicable, specific steps to be met to resume good academic standing status.

General Information

As much as possible, entering students are encouraged to make careful and informed decisions about the initial application to their declared majors. All majors at Cal Poly are impacted and it will be difficult to change into some majors despite a student’s best efforts. Nevertheless, sometimes students will find that their interests, abilities, or talents will take them in a different direction than they had identified when they originally applied to Cal Poly and they may seek to change to a different major. Depending on the degree of impaction of the target major (i.e., the relationship between the number of applicants to the major and the number of places available), there might only be a few spaces available for change of majors, or no spaces at all. Students who are unable to change into their desired majors might also need to consider applying to another university in the major of their choice.

If a student makes the decision to change major, doing so early in the academic career will better allow a student to make degree progress in a timely manner and stay within the university’s minimum progress to degree standards; major changes late in the academic career will be restricted by the university’s minimum progress standards, including the unit maximum.

All students, whether lower division (those with fewer than 90 Cal Poly units) or upper division (those with more than 90 Cal Poly units or 90 transfer units), intending to change majors must demonstrate that they can complete the new major within the minimum progress standards and the unit maximum set forth by the university. This is likely to be a greater challenge for upper division students, who will have fewer remaining degree requirements. Further, students need to be aware that not all departments can accommodate upper division change of majors.
INDIVIDUALIZED CHANGE OF MAJOR AGREEMENT

Name: ____________________________________________

EmplID: ____________________________________________ Today’s Date: ____________

Current College/Major: ____________________________ Current Catalog Year: ____________

Concentration (if applicable): _______________________ Minor (if applicable): ____________

Current Term (last completed term):

Current Term GPA: ____________ CPSLO GPA: ____________ Current Term Higher Ed GPA: ____________

Cal Poly Units Completed: ____________ Units Completed (towards target major): ____________

Target College/Major: ____________________________ Catalog Year: ____________

** ** ** **

REQUIREMENTS TO BE MET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Term #1 [ _______ Quarter] Requirements</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Term #2 [ _______ Quarter] Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Required Courses/Units*</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Required Courses/Units*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Additional Courses/Units**</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Additional Courses/Units**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>GPA Requirements:</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>GPA Requirements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term: ___________________________</td>
<td>Term: ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSLO: __________________________</td>
<td>CPSLO: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Ed: ______________________</td>
<td>Higher Ed: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Good Academic Standing</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Good Academic Standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVALS

Current Department Designee: ____________________________ Date ____________

Current College Designee: ____________________________ Date ____________

Target Department Designee: ____________________________ Date ____________

Target College Designee: ____________________________ Date ____________

I understand that academic disqualification or failure to meet the requirements to change major as outlined above will void this agreement.

Student Signature: ____________________________ Date ____________

Attached: Curriculum Plan for Target Major

ICMA.doc 1/25/10
Adopted:

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

AS-___-10

RESOLUTION ON
SELECTION PROCESS FOR THE NOMINATION OF
FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FOR THE SELECTION OF CAMPUS PRESIDENT

WHEREAS, The CSU Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents indicates that there will be an advisory committee to the Trustees committee in the selection of CSU Presidents (http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/PresidentialSearch.shtml). The Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSU) is to include the CSU campus Academic Senate Chair plus two faculty representatives. The two faculty representatives are to be elected by the campus faculty or, if a standing policy allows for the forgoing of a faculty election, that standing policy needs to be revised or ratified with each new presidential search; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has no standing policy for selecting the two faculty representatives to ACTCSU; and

WHEREAS, In January 2010, the Academic Senate used the consent agenda process to adopt the provisional policy, attached, for the election of two faculty representatives to the ACTCSU; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the policy, below, which is a slightly revised version of the provisional policy, henceforth be the standing policy for the election of two faculty representatives to future incarnations of the ACTCSU:

ACADEMIC SENATE SELECTION PROCESS FOR THE NOMINATION OF TWO FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE TRUSTEE COMMITTEE FOR THE SELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

1. The Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents (BOT Policy) specifies that in addition to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President established by the Office of the Chancellor, an Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) serves as one of the consultative groups in the selection of campus Presidents. Among the members of the ACTCSP is the Chair of the Academic Senate and two (2) “faculty representatives elected by the faculty” (http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/PresidentialSearch.shtml).
2. The nomination and election of the two faculty representatives to the ACTCSP shall be by and from those members of the General Faculty as defined by the Constitution of the Faculty (Article 1).

3. In order to provide the fullest possible representation of the colleges given the constraints of the BOT Policy, the combination of the two faculty representatives plus the Chair of the Academic Senate shall all come from separate colleges. Together the three shall have the following college affiliations:
   A. One representative from either CLA or CSM.
   B. One representative from CAFES, CAED, CENG, OCCT.
   C. The second elected position will be an at large position. It will go to the nominee who receives the next highest votes and is not faculty from either the college of the Senate Chair or the first elected person.
   D. In the event that one of the two elected representatives is unable to serve at any time during the search, the nominee who received the next highest number of votes in the election according to the specifications in 3 (including 3A-C) will serve in his or her stead.

4. To become a nominee for one of the two representative positions, an eligible member of the faculty must submit to the Chair of the Academic Senate the following:
   A. A statement not to exceed 200 words indicating how he or she interprets the role and responsibility of representing the Cal Poly faculty as a member of the ACTCSP.
   B. A nominating petition (including the statement from A) signed by a minimum of twenty (20) and maximum of thirty (30) members of the Faculty eligible to vote in this election. No more than five (5) signatures can come from the nominee's Department and at least five (5) signatures must be from faculty in a college other than the nominee's college. Eligible signatories may not sign nomination petitions for more than one candidate without rendering their signature ineligible.

4. At the request of the Office of the Chancellor to begin the election process for faculty representation, the Academic Senate Chair will make the call for nominations allowing for a nomination period of one week.

5. The Academic Senate Chair will also make the arrangements for the voting process, allowing for a voting period of one week.

6. The two candidates (from different colleges) with the highest number of votes shall be the faculty representatives to the (ACTCSP). If there are significant time constraints, a tie vote will be decided by the Academic Senate Chair. If time does allow, run-off elections will be conducted to deal with a tie vote. The Academic Senate Chair will not vote in the election.
Rationale for 3(A-C): All three representatives should be from different colleges from each other so that Cal Poly faculty has the broadest possible range of representation given the constraints of the BOT policy. The purpose of the at large position is to encourage the academic community to think in terms of electing the best candidates.

Rationale for 4(A): Requiring a statement of how a nominee would serve Cal Poly faculty on the ACTCSP will help faculty determine who is most likely to represent not only the interests of his or her department and college, but also the university more broadly.

Rationale for 4(B): Requiring that a nominee seek support outside of his or her department and college helps to ensure that our representatives are regarded by colleagues from across the campus as responsible representatives of Cal Poly faculty.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: December 27 2009
Revised: January 5 2010
BACKGROUND MATERIAL

Cal Poly Academic Senate Provisional Selection Process for the Nomination of Two Faculty Representatives to the Advisory Committee to the Trustee Committee for the Selection of the President

1. The Board of Trustees Policy for the Selection of Presidents (BOT Policy) specifies that in addition to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President established by the Office of the Chancellor, an Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP) serves as one of the consultative groups in the selection of campus Presidents. Among the members of the ACTCSP is the Chair of the Academic Senate and two (2) “faculty representatives elected by the faculty” (http://www.calstate.edu/datastore/PresidentialSearch.shtml).

2. The nomination and election of the two faculty representatives to the ACTCSP shall be by and from those members of the General Faculty as defined by the Constitution of the Faculty (Article 1).

3. In order to provide the fullest possible representation of the colleges given the constraints of the BOT Policy, the combination of the two faculty representatives plus the Chair of the Academic Senate shall all come from separate colleges. Together the three shall have the following college affiliations:

   A. One representative from either CLA or CSM.
   B. One representative from CAFES, CAED, CENG, OCOb.
   C. The second elected position will be an at large position. It will go to the nominee who receives the next highest votes and is not faculty from either the college of the Senate Chair or the first elected person.
   D. In the event that one of the two elected representatives is unable to serve at any time during the search, the nominee who received the next highest number of votes in the election according to the specifications in 3 (including 3A-C) will serve in his or her stead.

4. To become a nominee for one of the two representative positions, an eligible member of the faculty must submit to the Chair of the Academic Senate the following:

   A. A statement not to exceed 200 words indicating how he or she interprets the role and responsibility of representing the Cal Poly faculty as a member of the ACTCSP.
   B. A nominating petition (including the statement from A) signed by twenty (20) members of the Faculty eligible to vote in this election. No more than five (5) signatures can come from the nominee's Department and at least five (5) signatures must be from faculty in a college other than the nominee’s college. Eligible signatories may not sign nomination petitions for more than one candidate without rendering all petitions he or she has signed ineligible.

4. The call for nominations will be made on January 6, 2010 and the nomination period shall end at noon on January 13, 2010.
5. Ballots to elect the two faculty representatives along with each candidate's statement shall be distributed on January 14, 2010. The ballots shall contain the names of all qualified nominees, and voters will vote for two. Completed ballots must be received by the Academic Senate Office by noon on January 21, 2010 (Building 38, Room 143).

6. The two candidates with the highest number of votes (from different colleges) shall be the faculty representatives to the (ACTCSP). Due to time constraints, a tie vote will be decided by the Academic Senate Chair. Consequently, the Academic Senate Chair will not vote in the election.

*Rationale for 3(A-C):* All three representatives should be from different colleges from each other so that Cal Poly faculty has the broadest possible range of representation given the constraints of the BOT policy. The purpose of the at large position is to encourage the academic community to think in terms of electing the best candidates.

*Rationale for 4(A):* Requiring a statement of how a nominee would serve Cal Poly faculty on the ACTCSP will help faculty determine who is most likely to represent not only the interests of his or her department and college, but also the university more broadly.

*Rationale for 4(B):* Requiring that a nominee seek support outside of his or her department and college helps to ensure that our representatives are regarded by colleagues from across the campus as responsible representatives of Cal Poly faculty.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
December 11, 2010
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ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-____-09

RESOLUTION ON ADDITION TO
ACADEMIC SENATE BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
TO INCLUDE PROCESS FOR FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate of Cal Poly conducts its meetings in accordance with
        *Robert's Rules of Order*; and

WHEREAS, The protocol for CSU Academic Senates as well as the statewide Academic Senate
        is to submit an item in the form of a written resolution which is then deliberated
        over two meetings as a first and second reading; and

WHEREAS, First and second readings allow for reflective consideration of issues brought
        before the Senate; and

WHEREAS, *Robert's Rules of Order* does not address the deliberative process for first and
        second readings; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the following guidelines be used by the Academic Senate for first reading
        items:

- a first reading is a time for suggestions to be made to a resolution for its
  improvement. The resolution still belongs to its author and is not yet
  amendable

- a motion to suspend the rules may be used to move time-sensitive
  resolutions to second reading at the same meeting (a motion to suspend the
  rules is will be debatable in this case). Items cannot be moved to a second
  reading without compelling reason (the Senate Chair determines whether a
  reason is "compelling;" the Chair's ruling can be overruled by the body)

- if a matter is clearly noncontroversial, time may be saved by asking for
  unanimous consent rather than making a formal motion to suspend the
  rules

- the resolution may be moved to a second reading at a future meeting; and

be it further
RESOLVED: That the following guidelines be used by the Academic Senate for second reading items:

- the motion to adopt the resolution must be moved and seconded before debate ensues. It then belongs to the body and may be amended
- documents attached to a resolution are not amendable
- amendments of one sentence or more must be made in writing and submitted to the Senate in advance; and be it further

RESOLVED: That Article V, paragraph D, of the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be added to include the following provision:

First reading: voting on substantive resolutions (i.e., those involving University policy or those in which the Senate takes a position on an issue) takes place in two stages: first reading and second reading. In first reading, the resolution is introduced and suggestions for improvement or clarification are in order in first reading, but not amendments. The first reading of a resolution is concluded if (1) there is no one remaining who wishes to speak on the resolution, (2) a motion to close debate is passed (requires a two-thirds vote), or a motion is approved to move the resolution to second reading (requires a two-thirds vote, is debatable, and requires a compelling reason (determined by the Senate Chair, can be overruled by the body)). If a matter is noncontroversial, rather than a motion to suspend the rules, unanimous consent can be given by the body.

Second reading: voting on substantive resolutions shall take place only after a second reading of the resolution at a meeting subsequent to the meeting at which it was first introduced, except that the Academic Senate, by two-thirds vote of the senators present, may waive this requirement. After the motion has been moved and seconded, amendments may be presented for action by the Senate. Amendments of one sentence or more must be made in writing and submitted to the Academic Senate office in advance. Documents attached to a resolution are not amendable.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: October 13 2009
Revised: October 13 2009
Revised: November 17 2009