
1. Overall Summary of Feedback (by Themes)

1. Insufficient Breaks & Calendar Compression (Most Dominant Theme)

Across all units, the **lack of meaningful breaks between terms**—especially Spring → Summer and Summer → Fall—was the most consistent concern. Many noted **zero- or one-day transitions**, shortened winter break, and reduced Thanksgiving break. This was widely described as **unsustainable**.

Impacts:

- No time for grading, course prep, or recovery
- Continuous work cycles (often cited as 20+ weeks without break)
- Reduced ability to reset operationally (labs, systems, facilities)

2. Burnout, Well-being, and Workload Concerns

There is strong consensus that the calendar would **increase burnout for faculty, staff, and students**. Continuous teaching and lack of downtime affect:

- Mental health and fatigue
- Work-life balance (childcare, family obligations, religious observances)
- Staff capacity and morale

This is repeatedly framed as a **threat to sustainability and retention**.

3. Negative Impact on Teaching, Learning & Instructional Quality

Many respondents emphasized that compressed timelines would:

- Reduce course preparation and revision time
- Limit ability to incorporate student feedback
- Disrupt sequencing and depth of instruction
- Lower overall instructional quality

Lab-based and sequential disciplines (e.g., engineering, math, sciences) highlighted **significant pedagogical risks**.

4. Operational & Administrative Challenges

The calendar creates substantial **logistical and institutional strain**, including:

- Grading deadlines overlapping with new term start
- Prerequisite enforcement and academic standing issues
- Maintenance, lab reset, and safety inspection constraints
- Staffing and advising overload

Several units noted that “**breaks are not downtime—they are when essential work happens.**”

5. Misalignment with External Schedules

A major cross-cutting issue is misalignment with:

- Other CSU campuses and universities
- Community colleges (transfer pathways)
- K–12 school calendars
- Internship and employment cycles

Consequences include:

- Reduced internship and job opportunities
 - Challenges for credential programs and fieldwork
 - Childcare and family scheduling conflicts
-

6. Concerns About Year-Round Operations (YRO)

Many interpret the calendar as a **de facto shift to year-round operations** without:

- Clear communication of goals
- Implementation planning
- Adequate support/resources

There is skepticism about whether semesters can support YRO effectively, with some suggesting:

- Move to **14-week terms**, or
- Consider **quarter/trimester systems instead**

7. Calendar Design & Structural Issues

Specific structural concerns include:

- Early January start (too soon after holidays)
- Loss of full Thanksgiving break
- Saturday workdays and weekend finals
- Inconsistent term lengths and scheduling practices

These were viewed as **confusing, inequitable, or impractical**.

8. Impact on Research, Recruitment, and Institutional Competitiveness

The calendar may:

- Reduce time for research and scholarship
 - Harm faculty recruitment and retention
 - Make Cal Poly less competitive for students (especially internships and experience-based programs)
-

9. Equity & Access Concerns

Highlighted issues include:

- Disproportionate burden on caregivers
 - Impacts on students with disabilities or mental health needs
 - Unequal access to internships and opportunities
 - Cultural/religious observance conflicts
-

10. Common Recommendations Across Units

- Add **meaningful breaks between terms**
- Preserve a **longer winter break**
- Align with **K–12 and CSU calendars**
- Clarify YRO goals and provide **transparency + support**
- Consider **shorter semesters (e.g., 14 weeks)** or alternative systems
- Improve **multi-year planning and communication**

2. Summary by Business Area (by Themes)

BCSM (Bailey College of Science & Mathematics)

Key Themes:

- Severe concern about **lack of time between terms** (grading, labs, safety resets)
- Strong emphasis on **operational and lab constraints**
- Misalignment with internships, research, and K–12 (education programs)
- Workload and burnout concerns

Notable Perspective:

- Lab-intensive disciplines require **downtime for safety and preparation**
 - Suggestion to **move to 14-week terms or adjust summer structure**
-

CAFES (Agriculture, Food & Environmental Sciences)

Key Themes:

- **Compressed schedule and reduced breaks** seen as unsustainable
- Misalignment with **community colleges, K–12, and partners**
- Negative impact on **student opportunities (internships, study abroad)**
- Reduced faculty capacity for **research and program development**

Notable Perspective:

- Focus on **external partnerships and applied learning alignment**
 - Concern about **long-term planning disruption**
-

CENG (Engineering)

Key Themes:

- Extensive **operational, policy, and systems challenges**
- Strong concerns about **grading timelines, prerequisites, financial aid, and admissions**

- Significant impact on **internships and industry alignment**
- Facilities, lab maintenance, and infrastructure strain
- Faculty/staff burnout and recruitment risks

Notable Perspective:

- Most detailed on **administrative and systems-level breakdowns**
 - Highlights **accreditation (ABET) and compliance risks**
 - Raises **equity, housing, and student experience issues**
-

CLA (College of Liberal Arts)

Key Themes:

- **Burnout and lack of breaks** as primary concerns
- Strong emphasis on **misalignment with CSU, K–12, and internships**
- Early January start and Thanksgiving reduction problematic
- Lack of transparency and clarity

Notable Perspective:

- Frames issue as **tradeoff: efficiency vs. sustainability**
 - Highlights **impact on recruitment, retention, and morale**
 - Notes **equity and cultural impacts**
-

Library

Key Themes:

- Continuous calendar creates **operational strain and staffing challenges**
- Increased workload (~equivalent to adding a third term)
- Lack of downtime threatens **service quality and staff well-being**
- Need for **additional funding, staffing, and structural changes**

Notable Perspective:

- Focus on **service continuity and resource constraints**
 - Emphasizes need for **institutional investment to support YRO**
-

Solano Campus (Cal Maritime)

Key Themes:

- Focus on **regulatory and licensing constraints (USCG)**
- Conflicts between academic calendar and **exam schedules**
- Need for alignment with **sea-time requirements and credentialing**
- Operational issues (housing, dining, transitions)

Notable Perspective:

- More **neutral/pragmatic tone**, focused on **compliance and logistics**
 - Supports **tight sequencing** but with better alignment and planning
 - Emphasizes **program-specific constraints over general burnout narrative**
-

Bottom-Line Synthesis

Across all areas, there is **overwhelmingly consistent feedback**:

- The proposed calendar is viewed as **overly compressed, misaligned, and operationally unsustainable**
 - The **lack of breaks** is the central issue driving concerns about:
 - Burnout
 - Instructional quality
 - Administrative feasibility
 - There is **broad skepticism about moving toward year-round operations without structural changes**
 - While perspectives vary slightly by unit (e.g., compliance at Solano, operations in CENG, pedagogy in CLA/BCSM), the **core themes are highly aligned**
-

Bailey College of Science and Mathematics

AY 27-28 Calendar Feedback

College Comments:

Due to logistics of finishing and beginning terms, the amount of time between terms was found to be too tight. Processes such as:

- finalizing grades,
- prerequisite enforcement,
- establishing and communicating students' academic standing,
- course preparation, and
- resetting and performing safety checks for laboratories

require time between terms.

Potential solutions:

- Moving to 14-week terms in AY 27-28, with a small amount of support provided for each department to adjust curriculum.
- Changing summer 2028 to be a short summer, then increasing the time between terms.
- Mimicking AY 26-27 for AY 27-28 and moving to 14-week terms for AY 28-29 including summer 2029.

Department Comments Summary (ChatGPT-generated):

Major Themes

1. Insufficient Breaks (Primary Issue)

- Minimal or no time between terms (especially **spring → summer** and **summer → fall**)
- Shortened **winter break**
- Long continuous work periods causing **burnout**

2. Impact on Teaching & Learning

- Not enough time for:
 - Course preparation and revisions
 - Grading and feedback implementation
- Risks lowering **instructional quality** and student success

3. Operational Challenges

- Limited time for:
 - Maintenance, lab resets, and safety checks
 - Administrative tasks (advising, scheduling, system updates)
- Creates strain on campus infrastructure and staff workload

4. Misalignment with External Schedules

- Conflicts with:
 - **Internships and job timelines**
 - **Other universities**
 - **K–12 school calendars** (major issue for education programs)
- Complicates fieldwork, credential programs, and family planning

5. Work-Life Balance Concerns

- Affects childcare, family time, travel, and religious observance
- Weekend workdays and Saturday finals raise equity concerns

6. Concerns About Year-Round Operations (YRO)

- Many believe the calendar is effectively moving toward **year-round scheduling**
- Criticism of lack of transparency and planning
- Some suggest a **quarter system** may be better suited

Common Recommendations

- Add **meaningful breaks between terms**
- Preserve a **longer winter break**
- Align with **K–12 and standard academic calendars**
- Clarify goals around **year-round operations**
- Consider **shorter semesters (e.g., 14 weeks)** or alternative systems
- Improve **transparency and faculty involvement**

Department Comments (Raw):

[Biological Sciences](#)

[Chemistry & Biochemistry](#)

[Kinesiology & Public Health](#)

[Liberal Studies](#)

[Mathematics](#)

[Physics](#)

[Statistics](#)

[School of Education](#)

Biological Sciences Comments

Feedback on the 2027-28 Academic Calendar Consultation Memo_4.3.26

Biological Sciences faculty and staff were presented with memo via email. A survey was conducted for them to provide the following:

- Current position in the Department:
 - Administrative staff
 - Technical staff
 - Full-time lecturer
 - Part-time lecturer
 - Tenure-track professor
 - Tenured professor
- Approval status:
 - Approve
 - Reject
 - Abstain
- Feedback:
 - If you would like to provide written feedback concerning your view of implementing this calendar for 2027-28, please provide it below. Identifying specific advantages or disadvantages to support your case will be most useful.

Results from vote (N=34):

- Administrative staff:
 - 1 vote to reject
- Technical staff:
 - 5 votes to reject
- Full-time and part-time lecturers:
 - 9 votes to reject
- Tenure-track and tenured professors:
 - 17 votes to reject
 - 2 votes to approve
- Chair vote (not included):
 - Reject

Summary of Faculty & Staff Feedback on Proposed Trimester / YRO Calendar (2027–28) using ChatGPT:

Executive Summary

Feedback is **overwhelmingly negative** toward the proposed Year-Round Operations (YRO) / trimester calendar.

The dominant concerns center on:

- **Insufficient breaks between terms**
- **Severe risk of burnout for faculty, staff, and students**
- **Operational infeasibility for labs and support units**
- **Misalignment with CSU system, internships, and K-12 schedules**
- **Perceived lack of planning, consultation, and transparency**

A small minority expressed **conditional or limited support**, but only if **significant structural changes** are made (e.g., shorter terms, built-in breaks, phased implementation).

Major Themes

1. Lack of Transition Time Between Terms (Most Frequently Cited)

- Near-universal concern about **minimal or zero turnaround time**, especially:
 - Spring → Summer
 - Summer → Fall
- Reported impacts:
 - Inability to **grade, prepare courses, or reset labs**
 - Reduced **instructional quality**
 - Elimination of **true academic breaks**

Representative sentiment:

“Finish finals and start teaching the next day” is viewed as unrealistic and unsustainable.

2. Burnout & Well-being (Faculty, Staff, Students)

- Strong concern that the calendar creates an **“unrelenting pace”**
- Faculty highlight:
 - No time for **vacation, research, or course redesign**
- Staff highlight:
 - Loss of **downtime for maintenance and recovery**
- Students:
 - Expected **fatigue, disengagement, and absenteeism**

Predicted outcome:

Declines in morale, retention, and overall educational experience.

3. Laboratory & Technical Operations Constraints

Particularly strong concern from lab-based departments:

- Labs require **significant downtime** for:

- Cleaning, maintenance, equipment repair
- Material prep and safety checks
- Current proposal allows only **2–3 days (or less)** between terms

Additional issues:

- **Facilities not equipped** for summer (e.g., extreme heat, no AC)
 - Increased **safety risks**
 - Impractical to scale via staffing alone
-

4. Increased Workload Without Adequate Resources

- Staff and lecturers report:
 - Expanded responsibilities **without compensation or staffing plans**
 - Hiring more staff seen as:
 - **Unrealistic on proposed timeline**
 - Difficult due to **training and onboarding requirements**
-

5. Misalignment with External Systems

Widely cited concern that YRO undermines a key benefit of semesters:

- **Out of sync with CSU and national academic calendars**
 - Conflicts with:
 - Summer internships (typically June–August)
 - Graduation/hiring cycles
 - Transfer student pathways
 - Misalignment with **local K–12 schedules** creates childcare challenges
-

6. Loss or Reduction of Breaks (Thanksgiving, Summer, etc.)

- Elimination or shortening of breaks seen as:
 - Harmful to **family life and travel**
 - Likely to increase **student absenteeism**
 - Thanksgiving week particularly emphasized
-

7. Equity & Student Experience Concerns

- Staggered schedules may create:
 - **Unequal access** to internships and research
 - “Tiered” student experiences depending on term assignment
 - Concerns about:
 - Reduced **cohort cohesion**
 - Fragmented campus community
-

8. Institutional & Cultural Impact

- Many respondents believe YRO would:
 - Undermine Cal Poly’s **“learn by doing” model**
 - Damage **collaboration and governance** (faculty not on campus simultaneously)

- Repeated concern about becoming a “**test case**” for the CSU
-

9. Perception of Financial Motivation

- Many respondents believe the proposal is driven by:
 - **Revenue generation and enrollment growth**
 - Concern that:
 - Financial benefits are **unclear or unproven**
 - Costs to quality, staff, and students are **underestimated**
-

10. Process & Implementation Concerns

- Strong criticism of:
 - **Lack of shared governance**
 - Insufficient consultation with faculty/staff
 - Timeline seen as:
 - **Too aggressive**, especially following semester conversion
 - Frequent recommendation:
 - **Delay and phase implementation**
-

Constructive Suggestions (Minority but Consistent)

Some respondents offered alternatives:

- Delay YRO until **semester system stabilizes**
 - Adopt a **phased rollout**
 - **Shorten terms** (13–14 weeks) to allow breaks
 - Preserve **Thanksgiving break**
 - Improve **alignment with CSU and K–12 calendars**
 - Expand summer offerings **without full YRO**
-

Overall Sentiment

- **Strong opposition:** Large majority
- **Conditional/qualified support:** Small minority
- **Unconditional support:** Very rare

Bottom line:

The current proposal is widely viewed as **operationally unworkable and harmful to educational quality, workforce sustainability, and student experience** without substantial revision.

Below are all the written comments with alternating colors used to separate individual responses:

I would like to raise concerns about the proposed Year-Round Operation schedule and its impact on teaching laboratory operations. As it stands, the schedule does not provide sufficient time for recovery, reset, and preparation between terms. From a scientific lab standpoint, this transition time is critical for maintaining safety, instructional quality, and operational readiness. While hiring additional staff has been suggested as a potential solution, the proposed timeline presents practical challenges. Transitioning to Year-Round Operations only one year after moving from a quarter to a semester system does not allow adequate time to recruit, hire, and properly train new Instructional Support staff. These processes require careful planning and cannot be accelerated without risking effectiveness. I recommend allowing more time for the quarter-to-semester conversion to stabilize fully before implementing year-round operations. A phased approach would better support staff, preserve lab quality, and ensure a more sustainable transition overall.

This calendar appears to be put together as a way to see what is physically possible to write down in a calendar, without any consideration for the fact that human beings will have to follow that calendar. There are literally zero days of break for faculty between spring/summer and summer/fall. Exactly how will we be able to maintain the educational standards here with zero time to plan and revise our classes? How do you expect faculty to avoid burnout when they have to teach 15 weeks, then another 15 weeks with no time for themselves? Even if we ignore this, let's extrapolate this calendar a few years when fall term has to start later and later each year to accommodate the ~53-54 week academic year. Will final exams be scheduled on Christmas day? Will you add a layer of stress to winter break by having students take a couple weeks off of school and THEN take finals (basically ruining their Christmas/New Year celebrations)? It's just not a plan that is going to work and I think you know that.

I vehemently oppose this proposal. My colleagues in biology will eloquently detail why this is a unilateral rejection of what makes Cal Poly special. The negative impacts will be real, wide-ranging, and administration is showing yet again how little regard they have for our quality of life and culture. This is a transparent money grab.

I am overall supportive of the change to semesters, but see the following disadvantages of YRO:

The burden of summer session teaching is most likely to fall on junior faculty and lecturers. This will negatively impact the retention and hiring of new faculty. The summer flexibility is particularly important to young families because of alignment with childcare and school schedules.

This will take us off the semester system used by other CSUs and will make it harder for our students to line up internships and summer positions. They will also graduate at times outside of standard hiring cycles and could increase rates of unemployment among recent grads.

The turnaround between terms, especially between spring and summer, is too short. Prep for new classes will not be sufficient, and this will negatively impact the quality of teaching. It will also lead to burnout of faculty and students.

Removing the Thanksgiving break will mean that many students either cannot travel home for the holiday or will miss class/exams. As well, many childcare facilities are closed for the Thanksgiving week, as well as K-12 schools, so faculty and staff will have to find other childcare arrangements or cancel class.

The workload increase for support staff is unreasonable and will negatively impact the quality of hands-on lab experiences for students. It will also lead to staff burnout and delayed projects that are usually accomplished during school breaks.

Our lab spaces (Fisher/Sci North) are not equipped for summer sessions. Without air conditioning, lab spaces get up to nearly 90 degrees on warm days during the current school year. Students and staff cannot be expected to work in that environment.

the semester transition was supposed to put us on the same calendar as the rest of the CSU. This will take us off of it, making it harder for our students to line up internships etc (which almost always occur during the summer, because that is when every other university in the country is off)

The lack of time between trimesters is the biggest problem. When are teachers supposed to grade? When are they supposed to prepare? When are they supposed to take vacation? Unlike other jobs where it's possible to choose your vacation dates, teachers wait for breaks in their teaching schedule. I understand that a professor may not always be teaching in back to back periods, but they will have to sometimes. The only time where there is any prep time between the trimesters is a holiday break (Christmas).

This will also be hard on students who have back to back periods. I predict severe burn out for everyone. Learning takes a lot of energy, and we expect a lot from our students! And they will just be getting used to the longer semester system.

This schedule is just pretty awful.

I see no benefit and only harm that will come from switching to semesters next year, 2026-2027 (which is what the new Chancellor sought immediately) then switching to Year Round Operations the next year. I think that faculty, staff, and students will be much better served by adhering to a Semester schedule from here on. Having a "summer term" start in early May is a ludicrous idea if the intent is to encourage summer enrollment at Cal Poly. Most incoming Freshman won't be even remotely close to finishing high school in early May so that's essentially eliminating them from the summer term. The lack of time off between the Spring and Summer terms (one week!?) is abysmal and will cause student, faculty, and staff burnout immediately. This is absolutely absurd as a proposed calendar. I'm shocked that this is even being considered. Cal Poly has been unique for being on the quarter system compared to other CSU's. Please don't make us unique by adopting an obviously flawed schedule that no one involved in the actual teaching of students at the University is interested in.

Disadvantages to YRO

- 1) Disrupts faculty community as ~30% of the faculty will not be on campus at a given time. How can we expect efficient collaboration and decision making if a decent portion of our faculty will be gone throughout the year.
- 2) Significant burden to our technical staff. Our lab technicians utilize academic holidays to reset courses when we transition between terms. It's unreasonable to have them completely reset for reoccurring courses and prepping entirely new courses with only a couple days between terms. Additionally, faculty depend so heavily on prep work, but when will they ever have a break? A traditional job offers a certain amount of vacation time, but our lab technicians wouldn't necessarily have that same courtesy as they are the support for all our laboratory courses. Someone else would need to step in to provide that support or the technicians would need to double their workload in preparation of their absence; however, some of the course preparation cannot happen in advanced and must be completed in real-time.
- 3) Parking has been an incredible issue. Normally, I teach courses from 12-6 pm; however, arriving on campus and finding parking between 11-1 pm has been horrific. It has taken anywhere from 30-60 minutes to drive ALL over campus in search of a free spot. I have decided to arrive on campus 8 am to avoid this issue. This means I am spending 4 EXTRA hours on campus just to reserve a parking spot. This has become burdensome and is NOT normal. As faculty, we should not have to FIGHT for our ability to just be on campus to teach our courses. Switching to YRO would compound this issue with the need for additional faculty to support the additional classes being offered.
- 4) The turn around between spring and summer is unreasonable. The week transition between winter and spring quarters is always challenging, but reducing the turnaround time between spring and summer terms is unacceptable. We would have to take away focus of our current students in spring term to figure out logistics for summer term.
- 5) Reducing the week break for Thanksgiving down to 2 days is discouraging. How are students able to spend time with their loved ones when they aren't able to leave until the Wednesday before Thanksgiving? Some students may opt to miss class and leave earlier in the week, and that would disrupt the exposure they have to course material. This also inhibits faculty from taking the time they need to spend with their families.
- 6) These changes leave me with very little desire to continue on at Cal Poly. It is an unfortunate situation for both

me and my department as I generally support courses with 100+ students every quarter. There is little incentive for me to stay at an institution where I do not feel supported nor do I feel like my voice is heard.

As a part-time lecturer who works almost full-time, my voice is often not heard or considered. But the recent changes at Cal Poly have deep impacts on my ability to properly care for my family. Again, as a part-time lecturer, since my pay is so small compared to many other similar positions at other school systems, I have to be the primary care giver to my children so my spouse can work enough to support our household. Despite that, Cal Poly continually asks more from me without acknowledging the increased work load or offering increased compensation. If anything Cal Poly has made it harder, even taking away staff spots which means I have to park and walk farther, taking an additional 30-40 minutes every day away from either my family, my work, or my sleep just to arrive to and leave from campus (this is just one example of the increased burden placed on part-time lecturers as of recently).

While this may not seem germane to the calendar, this provides the necessary context for why I am opposed to this calendar and YRO in general. See, despite the fact that I am a part-time lecturer, I also provide full academic year support to a foundational course that in my estimation serves about 5% of the total undergraduate student population. That's a huge number. The switch to YRO and this calendar would require this course to be supported literally all year. This will have a personal impact in one of two directions: either I will need to work additional terms to support the course (and keep my job) or I will have to give up aspects of my job to other people who could or may be able to support this course better at other times. Neither of these options have my best interest at heart, and the latter option will require Cal Poly to hire additional support (where are all of these additional faculty offices going to go)?

PTLs have received little if any compensation for the additional workload being placed on us by the university for the semester conversion. YRO would place longer/additional burdens for this conversion. Is Cal Poly aware of this? Is there an offer for compensation for that?

This academic calendar (and whatever other ones you will likely propose) DO NOT follow the local school district. I already have to tote my children to campus on random Mondays they have off. If you "move" the President's day holiday, now I have to tote them with me to campus... again. SLCUSD already takes the Monday BEFORE President's day holiday off. So I have to bring them 2 weeks in a row? Even working the number of almost full-time WTUs, I still don't make enough to justify paying for this much care. SLCUSD also takes the first Monday off of elementary school. So now that's at least THREE Mondays in Winter I'm carting kids around campus?

That doesn't even consider 1) the fact that going back to school as early as proposed in August means another week of summer I'm not available for my family and 2) the fact that you've included Mon, Tues, Wed as academic days during the Week of Thanksgiving-- again, days that SLCUSD has off. At this point, it feels a little bit that between the proposed Cal Poly calendar and the SLCUSD calendar, the educational system is trying to dismantle working-parent-families. I have yet to see that this plan cares for the parents on campus (either faculty or student parents-- who are real and present).

This only addresses a portion of the problems with the calendar. I think it's awful for students and staff (especially for staff who technically support these courses year round). I think it's awful for the faculty work load between terms to properly wrap up a term and execute a new term.

In summary, I fail to see how the current plan (either this calendar or the YRO plan) has any aim to take care of the employees or parents on this campus. This WILL affect our health mentally and physically (already has) and WILL affect the quality of education Cal Poly can offer. We are best in the west for a reason.

1. Ideally, we'd be on the same schedule as the other CSU's. This schedule does not accomplish that goal.
2. The turnaround time between spring and summer terms is very short.
3. A week off at Thanksgiving allows everyone ample travel time. When the schedule just allowed for two days off in previous years, many students missed the three days of class that week anyway.
4. Most schools that are on the semester system have January off, not December. It would be nice to align with other schools schedules.
5. Summer starting at the beginning of May,

does not allow for internship opportunities to be undertaken by our students, as often those start in June and go through August.

The proposed schedule includes 1/3 less days when staff are working but students are not on campus. These days allow staff time to regroup, prepare for the next term, and complete tasks or maintenance that would otherwise disrupt classes. The loss of these days is not fixable by increasing staffing, and the concentration of these days would greatly increase delays in work while we wait for the student-free work days to conduct disruptive work. This loss of 1/3 of student-free work days also does not account for the difference in increased workload for summer term moving forward, so the issue is further compounded by increased attendance in summer.

2-3 days between semesters to turnover/clean and prep a class is not realistic. Our primary concern is how YRO will lead to burnout. Techs are expected to support all three semesters while still completing all the non-class support work typically done during the summer. That is a huge workload increase. Additionally, the number of nonteaching days (campus open, no class) that staff use catch up, prep, order, repair, shuffle labs and offices, make loud disruptive noises, etc. will decrease from 35 this year to 23 days in the 27-28 YRO calendar.

□

Non-Student Days (Staff Working)								
School Year	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring	Between Terms Non-Student Days	In-Year Non-Student Days	Non-Student Days	Total Non-Student Days
2024–25	0	4	1	0	28	5		33
2025–26	0	3	1	5	26	9		35
2026–27	0	3	—	6	30	9		39
2027–28	0	0	—	5	18	5		23
2028–29	0	0	—	—	—	—		—

Our work requires our physical presence for the set-up and breakdown of multiple labs. Because of this, just like instructors, any vacation requires that we "cover our class". Currently we have 28 workdays between quarters with a more flexible summer schedule to work in vacation that does not burden our coworkers. The 27-28 YRO calendar will reduce that to 18 with no summer flexibility. A summer (or any other) holiday would require: the tech to work 2x to prep current and vacation labs, other techs or instructors to work 2x to cover labs.

Both Fisher and Science North are without air conditioning. During the recent March heat wave, rooms on the third floor of Science North reached 88 degrees while empty. This will be a common occurrence with summer classes. I can't imagine taking an exam in a room like that with ~24 other endotherms.

One final random point. The 1st and 2nd year students are the covid cohort. They spent their 8th and 9th grade learning online. Their 2nd and 3rd year at Poly living semester conversion and then finally YRO. I wish we could do better for them.

The calendar as proposed leaves very little time for Technical staff to complete job duties typically done during the summer. These include preparing for the upcoming semester, ordering materials, shuffling lab and office spaces, fixing/maintaining equipment, and trouble shooting problematic or new lab activities. Asking technical staff to perform these duties while simultaneously supporting the current curriculum is a large increase in workload with no proposed solution or compensation.

Gaps between semesters are also when technical staff take vacations. Many of us have chosen our careers, in part, to facilitate a manageable work/life balance (having the same school breaks as our kids so that when my 4 year old's preschool is closed I can take a day off)...the proposed calendar is suffocating.

Lastly, specific to our department, though likely problematic across campus. Buildings 53 and 33 were constructed before the ramifications of human caused climate change had been felt. It is TOO HOT in classrooms during the summer. Without students present it is regularly 90 F in many rooms, add 25 great apes and the temperature increases. "Learn by doing"...it is easier said than done when the ambient room temperature is 98 F.

As a technical staff member I am concerned that I will be asked to support a significantly greater number of students while there seems to be no plan in place to increase the resources I will have to be able to do so. More broadly my concern is that the University is not a for profit enterprise and I don't believe increasing revenue should be the primary goal. If the goal of the calendar change is simple to increase revenue through increased enrollment it may succeed, however this is based on the assumption that the current demand for Cal Poly will be the same under the new model. Students admitted under the new calendar, especially those on a summer/fall schedule will have a fundamentally different experience than our current students. Including limited breaks and a change in cohort halfway through their "year".

I will leave most of the complaints to others, but I'd just beg that they move spring break back to Mar 27-31 so that it aligns with the K-12 school districts in the County (e.g. https://drive.google.com/file/d/19hRnp3yM2-yyf4bTsGP_0aFl23u5cL3m/view). They're getting rid of Thanksgiving Break, another week which families have used to travel together. Having spring break not align with other school district breaks makes it even harder. The current week doesn't even line up with, for example, a break between 7.5 week sessions for Spring semester, so moving it back a few weeks would have no impact on the academic calendar.

I don't have time to describe all of the ways this is terrible. Here's a start: 1. the semester transition was supposed to put us on the same calendar as the rest of the CSU. This will take us off of it, making it harder for our students to line up internships etc (which almost always occur during the summer, because that is when every other university in the country is off) 2. The turnaround between terms--especially between spring and summer--is too short. How can faculty possibly prep for a new term as the old one ends? How can students be expected to refocus after only a few days away? 3. Removing the week break for Thanksgiving will mean that many students either cannot travel home for that holiday (which is very important to so many families) or will miss class. Both are bad outcomes, and they will happen to many students. 4. How will this work in subsequent years if fall starts on Aug 12 and the following summer ends on Aug 22? That will necessarily shorten breaks between terms even more. That will make those transitions even harder for faculty and staff. 5. I still firmly believe that YRO is a terrible idea. I would guess that many students would choose to go elsewhere than start in summer (or Spring-Summer), removing many of the purported advantages of YRO. It will also fracture student relationships, with some students only on campus for 1 term per year. How can they form the close relationships that are essential to the college experience in that way? It will make departmental governance impossible, with up to 1/3 of faculty not participating in key decisions at any given time. Has the administration considered these issues? Are there any examples of similar universities to Cal Poly (e.g., not specialized or small liberal arts schools) successfully implementing YRO? I don't know of any, and I am strongly opposed to us being the test school. Cal Poly is so successful in part because of who we are. YRO WILL fundamentally change that, all in service of more tuition dollars.

Deadlines for grade submission are missing from this calendar, but it is hard to see how one term can begin the day after the previous term ends (Spring into Summer and Summer into Fall) and faculty would still have time to grade, submit grades, publish the Canvas sites for the following term, and start teaching. Students and faculty on a Spring-Summer or Summer-Fall schedule will be completely burned out, without a chance to travel to see family and take a break in between terms. This will be very bad for teaching and learning, and might be bad enough to discourage most students from doing anything other than the traditional Fall-Spring schedule, making this whole endeavor pointless. How is summer research, a cornerstone of the "learn by doing" ethos, going to work in this calendar? If your answer to this is "you work with whoever students are off on the same term as you" then I know you are totally removed from research and teaching and you should really step out of your office and engage in conversations with some students and faculty. How is faculty governance and major departmental decisions going to work when only 2/3 of us will be present on any given term? Similarly, how are RPT decisions going to work with this calendar if we require everybody tenured to vote, but now 1/3 of them will be on break? When do administrative and technical support employees get a break in this calendar? Right now they do a lot of things over summer, when things slow down, to prepare for the following year. Things like maintaining large equipment, preparing reagents that are used constantly in labs over the year, cleaning, repairing and replacing small laboratory equipment like microscopes, pipettes, etc. We cannot run for long without the work that goes on while classes are not in session. Losing Thanksgiving break will lead to students skipping class. The shortened Christmas break is not long enough for faculty/students to recover from one term and plan for the next one. Especially damaging for faculty and students who travel to see family or that host family. This calendar puts us out of sync with other CSUs, which was touted as one of the reasons we "had to" move to semesters. Not only are we out of sync with semester but also with quarter institutions and industry internships, making any kind of collaborative summer research

unviable. Can you please share the calendars of other institutions, especially polytechnic or with significant research programs, in YRO for comparison? The fact that none have been shared with faculty makes me feel like we are a guinea pig and we risk doing irreparable damage to the Cal Poly brand.

YRO is a great idea.

The turnaround between some terms is a real concern, especially the spring to summer transition, but the summer to fall is a problem too. Feels like our spring breaks on the quarter system, which are more like “wrap up one term and prep for another breaks.” Most importantly, the relentless pace with essentially no real breaks is horrible for everyone. The reduced Thanksgiving break (and the odd addition of things like celebrating President’s Day in November) is not going to function as intended. Many students and faculty will simply ignore it, as has happened at other institutions, which makes that week effectively useless anyway. On top of that, the contract structure creates some really strange discrepancies: for example, a Fall/Spring contract has 170 workdays, while a Spring/Summer contract would only have 162. That’s hard to justify and raises fairness concerns. Perhaps I’m not reading the table right, or it would not reflect the contract. Ultimately, it seems to me that if they really want to do year round operations, we will need to build in real breaks for both faculty and students and real preparation days for those that will have contracts that don’t include Fall Semester. The only real way of doing this is shortening each semester by several days or a week — probably something closer to 15 week semesters, including finals week.

I recommend shorter terms to accomplish the important work that happens in between terms. I think this schedule will result in lower job satisfaction in the long term, limiting the scholarship, maintenance, and community building that happens between terms. The calendar now appears to be unrelenting. Moving to a 13 or 14 week term would be much much better.

Insufficient breaks between terms, leading to faculty burn out. Not all students will have access to internships during their breaks, leading to inequity in opportunities that is against the Cal Poly model. Thanksgiving travel extremely difficult for out of state students. Support staff will also be greatly overburdened trying to figure out how to prepare for labs and student research materials without sufficient breaks in instruction.

The lack of breaks between terms is a serious problem with the proposed calendar. It's not so bad for those on fall-spring schedules, but spring-summer and summer-fall schedules would be a real grind. That grind will have negative effects on the quality of instruction as faculty lose enthusiasm and simply lack time to wrap up, prep, or do other professional work between terms. It will sap the enthusiasm of students to study. It may also lead to more absences during academic terms, as students and faculty take off and leave town when they feel like it instead of scheduling around academic breaks. People outside of academia might laugh about complaints that there's no break between terms and say that faculty will still get plenty of time off. However, there is currently an expectation that we will show up and teach consistently during the term. This means that we schedule family events and other travel outside of the term unless it's absolutely impossible. Academic year faculty get one personal holiday and zero vacations days per year, whereas other educated workers generally have more flexibility to schedule vacation at appropriate times throughout the year. A schedule that leaves no break between terms may lead to a breakdown of norms. Some faculty will just leave during the term and cancel class if that's the only way to take time off when children are off school or travel to see family in other parts of the state or country. To make YRO work, we are hiring new faculty who will be assigned to teach summer, but it will be much easier to make YRO work smoothly if some faculty who are here already choose to teach summer classes. Most would be unwilling to switch term assignments permanently, but some might be interested in extra pay for summer teaching or in swapping terms now and then for a year at a time. Either of these options is much less appealing if there's no break between terms. To switch calendars for a year, a faculty member would need to teach at least 3 consecutive terms at some point. Teaching fall, summer, and spring terms in the same calendar year would leave less time off than the two weeks of paid vacation often granted to new employees outside of academia. Given the level of specialization in of faculty in many departments, it will be very difficult to construct course calendars without a few volunteers for summer teaching from the established faculty. This calendar will make it harder to find those volunteers. In terms of YRO more generally, the administration has stated that it will allow Cal Poly to accommodate many more students without building lots of new classrooms and dorms. That's good for students who would be rejected otherwise. They also say that it will be a big financial boost to the university. The CSU system is under considerable financial pressure, so YRO could make the difference between expanding resources and serious cutbacks. However, YRO also brings costs and complications. More faculty mean a need for more offices and labs. It will be harder to schedule maintenance operations. More staff support will be required for lab

and field classes to run year-round. Any required class must be offered at least two terms per year or some students will be unable to take it. The academic calendar will be funky and won't match other schools. If the financial argument is compelling, the administration should show us the numbers, including an honest appraisal of the assumptions and uncertainty behind the numbers. They should also be able to make a clear argument that the financial resources will benefit students and faculty and outweigh the many negatives that we perceive. Perhaps the administration can make the case to us that the financial benefits justify YRO. Undoubtedly, there's some level at which avoided cutbacks or increased funding (to hire and support staff and faculty, buy equipment and supplies, support student research, boost salaries??) would outweigh the complexity and tradeoffs of YRO

I strongly object not only to the proposed calendar but also to the process through which it has been proposed.

Calendar:

1. There are no breaks between Spring and Summer or Summer and Fall. Faculty teaching either of those combinations will finish grading final exams and start teaching new classes potentially the very next day. This is awful for faculty morale and for our ability to appropriately prepare for our classes. Students taking either of those combinations will not have a real break either, which will be awful for student morale and their ability to start the new term in a positive way.
2. There is no time for equipment maintenance, putting our instructional support staff in an impossible position.
3. The proposed schedule will not match the schedule of anyone else: students transferring from community colleges or other 4-year institutions, typical summer internships, breaks for children of faculty and staff, etc. This completely ruins the benefit of semesters, to be on the same schedule as other CSUs; it also makes it more challenging rather than less for our transfer student population and for students pursuing summer internships (which I thought we were trying to encourage).

Process:

1. When the faculty objected to having YRO imposed on us with minimal consultation and no time to plan the curriculum, we were told there would be a delay to allow appropriate consultation and planning with faculty. None of that appears to have occurred beyond a very small group of faculty and administrators. For genuine shared governance, there need to be extended conversations with listening, not just a few presentations. Let us be part of the process and bring more voices into the conversation. And slow down! There is going to be so much chaos with changing to semesters, and so much we will need to fix about our curriculum. Let us do that first, for at least a few years, before asking us to change again. And let the current students graduate; they are already caught in a transition and it seems unfair to put them in 2 transitions.

2. There has been no evidence presented that YRO can be accomplished without decreasing the working, teaching and learning environment; on the contrary, it seems decidedly worse for students, faculty and staff. The only benefit that has been presented is that we could accommodate more students, raising money for the CSU. I understand that colleges and universities are struggling across the country and that there are serious problems with declining enrollment at other CSUs. But Cal Poly should not be asked to single-handedly rescue the CSU, at the expense of our excellence.

If we are expected to buy into what seems like a dreadful idea, show us the data:

- a) What other institutions are on a schedule like this, and are they comparable in terms of their lab-heavy curriculum, emphasis on learn-by-doing, emphasis on student research etc.? What problems have occurred at other institutions that have made a schedule change like this? There are rumors of other campuses trying this and reversing course- show us the actual data.
- b) Exactly how much money will this produce for the CSU, and how much money could be produced instead by alternatives- e.g. really beefing up the summer term without forcing it to be a full semester (e.g. reduced tuition and reduced student housing costs for summer, incentives for faculty to teach in summer)? Leveraging the student housing at the Cal Poly Maritime campus in the summer when their students are away at sea, to provide housing for SLO students on internships in the Bay Area? Trying to create more desirable opportunities at the CSU campuses losing enrollment- creating more polytechnics, spreading learn-by-doing, creating more high-demand programs (nursing, computer science, etc.), hiring Cal Poly faculty as consultants, etc.? There has been no evidence presented that these ideas would not also work and be far better for everyone involved.

It is driven by increasing profit, not student success.

I do not oppose the idea of YRO. However, the current plan does not consider the workload for staff, students, and faculty. Please do not just focus on how YRO works for a handful of upper admin staff; the majority of us do the day-to-day grind work. The current YRO schedule is making the disparity and inequality worse.

There are such significant issues with this calendar - including dates overlapping, unequal sessions, too tight turnarounds between sessions - it feels even hard to evaluate. It feels absolutely unrealistic that this will be able to be implemented in 2027 - who is assigned to which sessions, how does department governance work, etc.

I don't have time to answer myself as to how TERRIBLE this AND the earlier-proposed calendar BOTH are, for students, staff and Faculty. So, I'll share my colleagues' wording, with which I agree.

When Armstrong first got here, he tried to do semesters and met so much push-back that he had to put the idea on hold. I think even then, he had the YRO in mind. Rather than being transparent and communicate with us as others suggested, the administration has been sneaky and heavy-handed in passing on info to the faculty and students, leaving us guessing as to their motivations and the real reasons for these changes.

When we were told that we must switch to semesters, we were resistant, but we knew we could do nothing. The reasons they gave were irrelevant, but they tried to pay lip-service to us by saying the good things, like being on the same calendar as everyone else and more opportunities for students to have internships. For faculty, it was touted as helping them better align their family/kid obligations because the calendar would more closely follow the K-12 academic calendar. But again, these are irrelevant.

I think the real reason for this was because semesters ARE better from the CSU perspective for YRO. Once they get us to YRO (if it works), then it will make it easier for them to move other CSUs to that calendar as well because they are all on semesters. They needed their best university to be the test case. If it can work at Cal Poly, then it could work elsewhere. Their motivation is clear: enrollment at Cal Poly is booming and they can exploit this and make more money for the CSU by increasing our enrollment without investing in infrastructure; then they could try the same at other CSUs.

They don't care that this will fundamentally change the feel of Cal Poly. They don't care that this will be really bad for faculty, staff, and students. They are trying to generate more money for CSU. I don't think there is anything we can say or do that will delay or prevent this from happening.

1. the semester transition was supposed to put us on the same calendar as the rest of the CSU. This will take us off of it, making it harder for our students to line up internships etc (which almost always occur during the summer, because that is when every other university in the country is off)
2. The turnaround between terms--especially between spring and summer--is too short. How can faculty possibly prep for a new term as the old one ends? How can students be expected to refocus after only a few days away?
3. Removing the week break for Thanksgiving will mean that many students either cannot travel home for that holiday (which is very important to so many families) or will miss class. Both are bad outcomes, and they will happen to many students.
4. How will this work in subsequent years if fall starts on Aug 12 and the following summer ends on Aug 22? That will necessarily shorten breaks between terms even more. That will make those transitions even harder for faculty and staff.
5. I still firmly believe that YRO is a terrible idea. It will fracture student relationships, with some students only on campus for 1 term per year. How can they form the close relationships that are essential to the college experience in that way? It will make departmental governance impossible, with up to 1/3 of faculty not participating in key decisions at any given time. Has the administration considered these issues? Are there any examples of similar universities to Cal Poly (e.g., not specialized or small liberal arts schools) successfully implementing YRO? I don't know of any, and I am strongly opposed to us being the test school. Cal Poly is so successful in part because of who we are. YRO WILL fundamentally change that, all in service of more tuition dollars.

Given the SLO county instructional calendar and a high % of faculty and staff who have kids, could Cal Poly administration consider alternating the spring break week, and moving into 3rd week of the Spring term? This could be done every other year (2nd week alternates with 3rd week) to give an opportunity for parents-faculty to overlap their spring break with their kids spring break? <https://www.slcsd.org/about/calendar>

Keeping the Thanksgiving break as an entire week, as we do with the quarter system, makes most sense. In my experience, when we used to not have the entire week break, students would just end up taking the entire week off and not show up for class. It puts professors and instructors in a difficult position of having to police attendance (something we shouldn't have to do). It is also very helpful for Faculty with families, as most local public schools give the full Thanksgiving week break. Those two additional days could go at the beginning or the end of the Fall semester.

While the CSUs have a standard number of instructional days for an academic year (146-147), other universities outside the CSU have variation in the number of instructional days (130-140 days). Given that Cal Poly wants to move away from the standard CSU calendar, it seems reasonable that we would also reduce the number of instructional days required in an academic year. This would enable sufficient and necessary breaks for students and faculty between semesters. While I recognize that that a shift like this would require an exception to a current policy and labor negotiations, it seems necessary to make a change, rather than try to fit Cal Poly's new model into the current system model.

1) There are going to be serious equity issues between students by having them start on staggered terms. The fall-spring students are going to have a HUGE advantage over the other students because of the availability of funded summer internships and the availability of substantial more TT professors for research projects during summer. For the biosciences, simply having a UG degree (even from Cal Poly) is not enough to separate you from the masses of other graduates during job interviews. The thing that sets a student up for success is research experience. And the only time a student can get meaningful research completed is during the summer when TT professors have the time to spend with them. How will the student on non Fall-Spring schedules get these opportunities? They will not! They will be ineligible for Frost, NSF REUs, Seagrant Fellowships, etc. This will create a tiered class system in the uni among students, which is unacceptable. Also, with the proposed calendar even our our fall-spring students may have to reject summer internships because our calendar doesn't align with anybody else! This, in my mind, is a deal breaker and is a primary reason YRO should not happen.

2) There are extreme issues with a lack of preparation time between terms. This will be extremely challenging for profs, staff and students who need time in between terms to catch up on other projects, prep for the new term, take time off, or take care of family members. The proposed schedule is ridiculous. There is a reason semester means half. You are trying to pack 3 full semesters into the calendar and it just doesn't work. There is a good reason that no other universities in the county do this. A shortened summer term with more specialty classes and a 1-2 terms of summer attendance requirement for all students would work great though! We would do well by them to give them deep research opportunities in the summer with fewer, shorter, but more intensive courses. This would be great for field courses too.

3) Going to YRO is going to have massive impacts for staff in particular. The folks that do course prep, maintain facilities, and run our office absolutely need extended time between terms to develop new ideas, do deep work, and take time off. By foisting this upon them you are going to run into very overworked and angry staff, and this will change the tenor at Cal Poly. We have a special place here and most of us love where we are. Don't ruin it by going to YRO.

I echo what all others in my department have said thus far. Here are some of my most substantial concerns.

1. Thanksgiving break needs to be the whole week. All the students just miss class anyway when you schedule school that Monday and Tuesday and faculty cannot use those days for exams or anything of substance. It is a huge headache.
2. There is a HUGE disparity in instructional days between Fall (87), Spring (83) and Summer (79). That is a major workload inequity issue. And also wouldn't it be obvious that you should not have those two days of Thanksgiving break be off to make these numbers more similar??
3. It is absolutely unacceptable to have no break between the end of Spring Term and the beginning of Summer Term. UNACCEPTABLE. You need to have an entire week off - minimum- so that students and faculty have a change to recharge. This will lead to burnout for everyone: students, faculty and staff who will not be able to clean up labs from one term and get ready for the next. It is insulting that you would even consider sending out a schedule with no break between terms.
4. I am also very confused about the lack of break between the end of Summer term and Fall Starting back up. Faculty cannot be expected to finish up one term and immediately jump into fall conference week with no chance to recover.

5. This calendar once again misaligns us at CalPoly with everyone else's calendars, which is exactly what the semester conversion was supposed to fix. This is ridiculous.

6. YRO is a BAD idea for our university. You have asked to much of your people here at Cal Poly all at once with the semester conversion and now this. At a minimum, YRO undoes all of the hard work we have done to switch to semesters.

7. If I could put an exclamation mark behind my rejection vote, I would. I have significant concerns that the current calendar does not adequately respect faculty and staff time and workload. Honestly, I think it is insulting that this calendar was even sent out for review.

Chemistry & Biochemistry Comments

Overall, how would you rate this calendar?	Please explain the reasons for your rating.
1	the breaks between semesters are too short
5	I'm concerned that there is not much of a break between Spring 2027 classes and the start of the Summer 2027 term, particularly for faculty who will potentially have to teach both of those terms back to back. I don't really see a good way to avoid this problem though.
2	I think we should continue to give our students the entire week of Thanksgiving break. One of the benefits of moving to semesters was that we wouldn't have to go back to class right after the new year (e.g., on January 3rd), and with this new schedule we are starting classes very early in January again. The fall semester is almost a week longer than the summer semester. Why not have the same number of days of instruction in all semesters so that once we design a course for a certain number of days of instruction, we don't have to keep changing it every semester? I also don't understand how the schedule can start on August 12 and end on August 23. How is the schedule going to work for the following year?
4	
1	I thought we were moving to 14 week semesters once year-round operations started? This calendar seems unsustainable, especially spring/summer or summer/fall, with no break in between.
2	There is not sufficient time between the class sessions. For example, having the summer term end on T 22 AUG and the Fall term start the next day is not feasible for faculty.

	This class schedule will no longer coincide with other institutions so summer internships will be extremely difficult to accommodate. This schedule will also have a significantly negative impact on our summer research programs, which utilize instructional equipment
	The schedule is fine. It is not a shock to me because it is similar to the 4 academic calendar that is followed in Canada
	This spring break will clearly not align with SLCUSD spring break. This is a massive issue for faculty with children in school. I have other concerns with the calendar as well, but this is the single most 1 important issue to me.
	It seems reasonable enough for a trimester system. There is not 4 much of a break between summer and fall.
	If we are going to trimesters then they just need to do it and stop messing around with us. It is unacceptable to have no break between the spring and summer term. (For faculty AND students.) If we want to be on three equal semesters (which if we are doing YRO then we should), then they need to shorten each semester. Plenty of schools have semesters that have 4 closer to 65-70 days of instruction. CSU needs to change policy.
	Not enough downtime for facilities to perform preventative maintenance where spaces need to have no students and not enough 2 time for time off for vacation/procedures

Kinesiology & Public Health Comments

Faculty and staff responses to the proposed 2027–2028 Cal Poly academic calendar were overwhelmingly critical, with most commenters arguing that the schedule is too compressed and removes essential breaks needed for recovery, course preparation, and campus operations. A central concern was the lack of time between terms, especially across spring, summer, and fall, which respondents said would create an unsustainable stretch of continuous work for students, faculty, and staff. Many warned that the compressed structure would hurt instructional quality by leaving little time to revise courses, prepare materials, or support student success, while also disrupting important administrative and facilities work such as maintenance, lab repairs, audits, advising updates, and system resets that typically happen during breaks. Additional concerns included reduced time for research, conflicts created by Saturday finals and weekend workdays, and negative effects on family responsibilities, religious observance, travel, internships, and job opportunities that follow semester-based timelines. Overall, the feedback suggests that respondents see the proposed calendar as operationally difficult and harmful to academic quality, wellbeing, and long-term sustainability, and they strongly favor a model that preserves more buffer time and meaningful breaks.

Faculty or Staff	Comments
Faculty	The proposed timeline misaligns our students with other universities in remaining competitive for internship and starting job. Many of the public health internships run on semester timelines. Additionally, the lack of breaks between semesters makes it difficult to adequately prepare course materials in time for the next quarter. It also does not provide students with the ability to prepare and decompress between semesters.
Faculty	Students and faculty on spring/summer will go 22 straight weeks (March 22-August 18) without a week off, with no time to decompress or prepare between semesters. If cal poly is going year round it needs to be 14+1 to make it at all manageable, which is so frustrating after we just realigned all courses to be 15 weeks.

Faculty	<p>In addition to what has already been included above, the 27-28 calendar removes the week long Fall Break that students, their families and faculty and staff have become accustomed to. It will result in absenteeism, cancelled classes and compressed travel timelines for students, faculty & staff who travel great distances to be with family for the holiday. It also eliminates time for repair/restocking/cleaning in labs to prepare for lab finals that happen the next week.</p>
Faculty	<p>Faculty workdays scheduled on weekend days are a huge problem and will disproportionately impact those with dependent care responsibilities or part-time faculty who have other jobs. Are faculty and staff going to be required to report to campus on those days?</p>
Faculty	<p>The compressed timelines between terms provides no time for maintenance, equipment refresh, repair of damage to classrooms, labs, studios. When will safety audits be performed and when can these issues be mitigated without taking the facility off line.</p>
Faculty	<p>No information or planning has been shared to assure that faculty will have access to facilities and equipment to pursue research activities.</p>
Faculty	<p>The inclusion of Saturdays in the final exam periods is problematic on many levels and creates potential conflicts with caregiving responsibilities, religious observances, and student employment. The lack of breaks between Spring-Summer and Summer-Fall terms is untenable. This compresses faculty time for course preparation and research productivity, and removes important recovery time for both students and faculty.</p>
Faculty	<p>The lack of breaks makes it impossible to make necessary revisions to courses based on student feedback. Formal course evaluations are an opportunity for faculty to receive honest student feedback, which allows us to change course plans and activities. However, we need some time between receiving the course evaluations and the start of the next academic semester. Without a break and time to make revisions, we won't be able to respond to student feedback.</p>

Staff	<p>The lack of a summer break makes it difficult for staff to do the regular maintenance work that normally takes place during this time; i.e. updating advising lists, updating email lists, updating websites, updating directories, rearranging faculty workspaces, organizing department resources etc. The lack of a break in between Spring-Summer and Summer-Fall only compounds this issue, and removes breathing room that is vital for students, faculty and staff.</p>
Faculty	<p>There are no positives to this calendar. The calendar needs to move to a 14+1 to ensure symmetrical semesters. The proposed calendar does not account for the administrative burden on the department to start and stop a term. Also, the administration should be working with faculty on an appropriate calendar. Finally, the Solano campus, with only about 800 students, should not dictate the San Luis Obispo campus calendar. There needs to be 2 separate calendars.</p>
Staff	<p>Poorly thought out calendar. Does not take into account prep time needed between terms. Doesn't allow for time off/vacation with families if summer term is a full 15 weeks. Maybe Summer needs to be a reduced term/half semester? The quality of education will decline if work/life balance is not achieved. Staff in particular will be asked to do more work without increased compensation. Are there any examples of Colleges who have successfully implemented YRO? If this is all about bringing in more money for Cal Poly, the admins should rethink their strategy. Looking forward to 28-29, Fall starts 10-14 days later leading to a very short Holiday break before Spring starting right after Jan 1.</p>

Liberal Studies Department Feedback

Prompt 1:

Please provide feedback on the 27/28 AY calendar. Feedback could include positives about the calendar, challenges, LS program implications if this calendar is adopted...

1. Misalignment with Local K–12 Calendars

- Spring break and overall term timing do not align with local districts (e.g., SLCUSD).
- Creates significant challenges for LS courses and any fieldwork dependent on K–12 classroom access.

2. Compressed Academic Calendar / Insufficient Breaks

- Very short turnaround between Fall and Spring (early January start).
- Limited time for faculty/staff recovery, childcare coordination, and course preparation.
- Concerningly tight transition from Spring to Summer.

3. Impact on Teaching, Learning, and Operations

- Uncertainty around prerequisite verification between terms.
- Insufficient time for course planning and student readiness.
- Potential negative effects on student well-being and faculty effectiveness.

4. Long-Term Calendar Sustainability Concerns (28–29 AY)

- Worry that the proposed structure creates downstream compression in future years.
- Likely encroachment into late Dec. and early January starts in subsequent cycles.

5. Misalignment with Original Semester Conversion Goals

- Calendar does not align with other CSU campuses.
- Could hinder participation in CSU-wide initiatives (e.g., CSU Online course catalog).

6. Program-Specific Implications (Liberal Studies)

- Field placements and partnerships with local schools become harder to coordinate.
- Disrupts core program components reliant on consistent school access.

7. Calendar Design / Structural Concerns

- Terms not starting on Mondays seen as poor practice (minor but notable issue).

8. Work-Life Balance and Equity Considerations

- Disproportionate impact on faculty/staff with children in local schools.
- Reduced alignment between prof. responsibilities and personal/family needs.

Prompt 2:

What suggestions/recommendations do you have for revising the 27/28 AY calendar?

1. Realign Spring Term Timing

- Shift spring break later (by ~2 weeks) to better align with local K–12 districts.
- Consider starting the spring term later in January (e.g., second week).
- Avoid unnecessarily early end to the spring term.

2. Prioritize Instructional Terms Over Summer

- Do not compromise Fall and Spring structure to accommodate a “year-round” or expanded summer model.
- If needed, balance terms by adjusting instructional intensity (e.g., hours/week) rather than compressing core terms.

3. Maintain Autonomy from Specialized Calendars

- Do not shape the main campus calendar around Maritime’s at-sea schedule.
- Allow for intentional misalignment where necessary given the scale differences.

4. Align with Local K–12 Calendars

- Design the academic calendar with local school schedules in mind.
- Critical for both field-based courses (e.g., LS) and faculty/staff with school-aged children.

5. Improve Calendar Structure and Consistency

- Ensure all terms begin on a Monday.
- Consider more consistent and practical break structures (e.g., potentially shorter spring break in exchange for better overall timing).

6. Support Work-Life Balance and Instructional Quality

- Provide adequate transition time between terms (especially January start).
- Enable sufficient time for course preparation, student readiness, and family coordination.

Prompt 3

Do you have any questions about the 27/28 AY calendar and/or additional feedback?

1. Shift Toward Trimester-Like Structure

- Is this calendar effectively moving us toward a trimester model, and if so, is that an intentional and viable direction?

2. Compression of Instructional Time (15 → 14 Weeks)

- Are we formally transitioning to a 14-week instructional semester plus finals, and what are the implications of that shift?

3. Need for Proactive Course Redesign

- What support and expectations are in place for faculty to redesign 15-week courses into a 14-week format?

4. Q2S (Quarter-to-Semester) Process Integrity

- How does this calendar align with the original intent of the Q2S course proposal process, and are there gaps between planning and implementation that need to be addressed?

Mathematics Comments

There were no positive responses, only "overwhelmingly negative" and a few "neutral."

Aside from the observation the quarters are designed to be year-round, the general concern is that students and instructors will have difficulty maintaining the proscribed pace with so little break between terms. Another frequent comment is that larger (and longer) math conferences tend to be scheduled around 'standard' university schedules and these will be even harder for math than is currently the case. In fact, one comment notes the irony that one of the benefits of the semester system is a longer winter break but the current schedule exactly precludes it. I'll add that one of the reasons given for the moral necessity of semester conversion was conforming to the schedules of other universities, which also seems to have been lost in the shuffle.

The general feeling seems to be the intended surrender to the real issue—yes, if it's to be year-round we'll have to convert to 14 weeks. I would add that going to year round operation before making the change to 14 weeks seems ridiculous. It might be too late now since yes, we will need time to adapt, but the wound would appear to be self inflicted. We were promised 15 weeks for two years and now year-round is encroaching on that promise.

General feelings toward the calendar. Overall, how do you feel about the proposed 27/28 academic calendar	Are there specific issues (for Math) which will make this calendar difficult to implement?	Are there specific issues (for Math) which adopting this calendar will facilitate?	Any other comments?
Neutral			My only comment here is that there are generally too many unknowns in a year round operations transition to even make something like viewing a potential calendar meaningful. With so many other logistical questions unanswered, the calendar seems like the least of the problems. If we can get a more comprehensive idea of what yearround even means, we would be better

			<p>equipped to give feedback about this. It seems like they're asking for feedback about the wrong thing, and at the wrong time. This calendar will be fine because adjusting by a week earlier or later is not the issue here. The feedback needed to be about the other effects of yearround operations, and much earlier than this (like, before we were told that this was happening whether we liked it or not).</p>
Neutral	<p>The big math conference JMM happens early January and I thought semesters would fix the fact that we all have to get cover to attend it. I guess the new calendar means we're back to the old quarters problem again.</p>	No	<p>There is no mention of how the subsequent calendar will work. Particularly, it looks like you will either need to shorten the semester or have a much shortened winter holiday break. Neither sounds great, but please don't change the 15 weeks. This needs to be stable to course planning.</p>
Very negative	<p>Grading math final exams and prepping for a new course together in a few days.</p>	<p>I cannot see any positives, if that is what you are asking</p>	<p>I think it's best to go to 14-week semesters. We NEED breaks.</p>
Very negative	<p>Attending some conferences will become more difficult.</p>	No	<p>While faculty have held strong on 15 week semesters this seems to be a function of the administration asking us to plan 15 weeks semesters.</p>

			<p>No one would ever argue this works in conjunction with year round operations. My biggest issue is the short turn around from Spring to Summer and Summer to Fall. As a faculty member this is a big ask from a grading/planning perspective, more importantly this is an unfair ask for students. Students need time in between terms to reset and prepare to get back to the grind. A few days is not it, Spring/Summer students will in essence be in school for 32 weeks straight, this will impact their view and possibly the view of others about the quality of the education being received. As a parent with an almost college age student, I would definitely dissuade them from coming to Cal Poly and being required to attend summer semester since the transitions are unfair and likely detrimental to their education. It feel like there are two fixes, go to 14 weeks with financial support for faculty to make necessary curricular changes, or stay on quarters. Quarters are perfect for year round operations!</p>
Very negative	The short turnaround on specifically		Generally opposed to trying to fit 3 semesters into a

	spring to summer will make it hard to grade all the finals and prep for the upcoming quarter. This is worse for math because grading takes a while due to long tests.		year. If you want year round, just run 4 quarters.
Very negative	The students will be not be successful with so little time between semesters	NA	If we are going to 3 full semesters in one year, then they need to be 14 weeks long.
Very negative			I feel the logistics of this idea were not fleshed out before committing to it. It feels like another thing faculty were told would happen without having a say. It diminishes my good feelings and loyalty toward CP.
	Yes. Mathematics courses depend heavily on continuity, depth, and carefully structured pacing (none of which are particularly compatible with a fragmented, year-round calendar layered on top of a semester	It is not clear that this calendar meaningfully facilitates mathematics instruction. While increased "flexibility" is often cited, mathematics tends to benefit from stability and sufficient time-on-task rather than constant turnover. If the goal is to maximize year-round utilization, it	The transition to a year-round schedule effectively eliminates one of the few genuine advantages of the semester system: the longer winter break. This is not merely a convenience; it is essential time for course preparation, curriculum revision, conference travel, and sustained research. Reducing or eliminating this period will leave faculty with significantly less time to engage in these activities, ultimately

	<p>system). Sequential courses will be especially vulnerable to disruption, as shorter breaks and tighter turnarounds leave little room for students to consolidate knowledge or for faculty to recalibrate instruction. Of course, institutions that truly want continuous, year-round instruction often adopt a quarter system, which is actually designed for that purpose. Attempting to retrofit semesters into a year-round model seems likely to produce the drawbacks of both systems without the benefits of either (especially the drawback of losing the longer winter break).</p>	<p>is worth noting that the quarter system already accomplishes this in a more coherent and intentional way. Under the proposed model, the gains appear minimal, while the costs to instructional quality are significant.</p>	<p>impacting both teaching quality and research productivity. If the intention is truly to operate year-round, it is hard not to notice that the quarter system already does this (successfully and by design). This proposal, by contrast, removes key benefits of semesters (such as meaningful breaks) without fully embracing the structural advantages of quarters. The result risks being a system that is less effective for both teaching and research.</p>
Neutral			The final exam schedule for Fall of 2026 has 7am

			classes that meet 4-5 days a week at 7pm on Friday. That's not in line with the practice of having the exams overlap the time classes meet, and should be changed.
--	--	--	--

Physics Comments

Summary of Cal Poly PHYSICS faculty feedback on the proposed 2027–2028 academic calendar

Note: Feedback collected through a shared document on OneDrive, distilled to this summary with ChatGPT on April 20, 2026.

Executive Summary

Faculty response was **overwhelmingly negative**, with the dominant view that the proposed calendar is operationally impractical, misaligned with the stated rationale for semester conversion, and insufficiently responsive to prior faculty input. A smaller number of comments expressed openness to a more symmetric/year-round model, but even those comments generally said the current proposal is not yet well designed.

Major themes in the feedback

1. No break between spring and summer is the most significant concern.

Faculty repeatedly emphasized that a zero-day transition between spring and summer is not workable. Concerns included lack of time for grading, course preparation, advising, scheduling, enrollment processing, lab resets, and equipment repair. Several also raised student-facing problems, especially for prerequisite checking, add/drop timing, and registration if spring grades are not posted before summer deadlines.

2. The winter break is too short for a semester system.

Many comments argued that one of the main advantages of moving to semesters was having more meaningful time between terms for course preparation, research, recovery, and administrative reset. Faculty feel the proposed calendar largely removes that benefit.

3. Synchronizing spring break with the local K–12 calendar emerged as a particularly important request.

Multiple faculty specifically and emphatically asked that spring break be aligned with the **San Luis Coastal USD calendar**. This appears to be one of the clearest actionable requests in the feedback. The concern is both practical and morale-related: misalignment creates family and caregiving difficulties for faculty, staff, and students with school-aged children, and many respondents see local calendar alignment as a basic quality-of-life issue the university should prioritize.

4. The proposal is viewed as inconsistent with the original rationale for moving to semesters.

A recurring point was that faculty were told semester conversion would better align Cal Poly with other CSUs and community colleges. Many respondents argued this calendar does not resemble a conventional semester calendar and instead appears to move toward a year-round or symmetric-term model without clearly saying so.

5. There is strong concern that this is a de facto move toward year-round operations without transparency or support.

Multiple comments interpreted the calendar as an attempt to introduce YRO without clearly acknowledging that goal or providing a clear explanation, implementation plan, or resources. Some faculty said that if shortened or symmetric terms are the real objective, that should be stated openly and paired with support for curriculum redesign rather than introduced indirectly through the calendar.

6. Faculty and staff workload concerns are substantial.

Comments described the proposal as likely to increase burnout for faculty, staff, and technicians. Respondents noted compressed transitions, repeated duty cycles, limited lab turnaround time, and the prospect of needing to revise courses again shortly after completing extensive quarter-to-semester work.

7. Several calendar details were seen as impractical or inequitable.

Frequently mentioned examples included:

- Saturday “Faculty Work Days”
- Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving week being instructional days, with Wednesday as a faculty work day and only Thursday/Friday as holidays
- “Tuesday follows Monday schedule” workarounds
- The framing of spring break as Monday–Sunday

These were criticized as likely to create confusion, poor attendance earlier in Thanksgiving week, and in some cases equity or religious-observance concerns.

8. Shared governance and process concerns were prominent.

A major source of frustration was not just the calendar itself, but the feeling that earlier faculty concerns were ignored. Several comments described the process as top-down, disrespectful, and erosive of shared governance, especially given how much faculty effort has already gone into semester conversion.

9. Student experience concerns were also central.

Faculty worried about attendance, access to internships and summer research, course sequencing, registration logistics, and the impact on students who are off flowchart or depend on timely prerequisite clearance. Some comments argued the calendar could make an already difficult enrollment environment worse.

Minority/supportive views

A small number of comments were more favorable toward the general idea of a more symmetric calendar. These respondents saw possible benefits such as more balanced three-

term activity, longer “off-terms” for research or internships, and greater faculty flexibility. However, even supportive comments usually agreed that the current proposal does not leave enough time between terms and would be more viable only if the university moved deliberately to shorter terms with transparent goals and proper curricular support.

Bottom line

The faculty feedback suggests **broad opposition to the current proposal as drafted**. The strongest consensus points are:

- add real break time between spring and summer,
- preserve a more meaningful winter break,
- **align spring break with the local K–12 calendar,**
- align the calendar more closely with standard semester patterns,
- clarify whether the university is pursuing YRO,
- and engage faculty transparently before making another major structural shift so soon after semester conversion.

Statistics Comments

1. Insufficient Breaks Between Terms (Primary Concern)

The most consistent concern is the lack of adequate transition time between terms. In particular:

- There is effectively no break between the end of Spring 2028 and the start of Summer 2028 (grades due May 2; summer term begins May 3).
- The winter break between Fall 2027 and Spring 2028 is perceived as shorter than typical for a semester system.
- Minimal gaps throughout the year raise concerns about sustained workload without recovery time.

Respondents emphasized that this structure may lead to significant faculty and student burnout and may not allow sufficient time for grading, course preparation, and rest.

2. Summer Term Viability and Participation

While the calendar appears designed to support a robust summer term and year-round operations, many respondents noted that:

- The absence of buffer time before and after summer reduces its attractiveness for faculty.
- The early start date (May 3) may conflict with external schedules, including K–12 calendars.
- There is concern that participation in summer teaching may be uneven, potentially placing disproportionate burden on certain faculty groups.

3. Imbalance and Asymmetry Across Terms

Several comments noted inconsistencies in how breaks and instructional time are distributed:

- Spring includes a full week-long break, while Fall relies primarily on Thanksgiving (Thursday–Friday), which may not function as a meaningful break in practice.
- Differences in holiday distribution and instructional pacing raise concerns about equity and planning.

4. Misalignment with External Academic and Professional Timelines

The proposed calendar places the academic year out of sync with many peer institutions:

- Spring term concludes in late April, earlier than typical semester systems.
- This may create challenges for internships, employment start dates, and graduate program transitions.

5. Start and End Date Concerns

Respondents expressed concerns about both ends of the academic year:

- The early August start for Fall compresses summer availability.
- The early January start (January 3) creates logistical challenges for post-holiday travel.
- The early December end is perceived as less useful if it does not align with broader schedules.

6. Operational and Implementation Questions

Additional concerns include:

- Use of non-standard scheduling practices (e.g., “Monday schedule on Tuesday”).
- Inclusion of faculty workdays on weekends.
- Limited clarity around Fall Conference scheduling in 2028.
- Questions regarding how teaching assignments across three terms would be determined.

7. Broader Concern Regarding Year-Round Operations (YRO)

Several respondents expressed concern that the calendar is being driven primarily by the goal of year-round operations, potentially at the expense of feasibility, sustainability, and instructional quality.

Summary

Overall, feedback indicates that while there is openness to exploring expanded summer offerings and year-round structures, the current proposal raises significant concerns about workload sustainability, calendar balance, and alignment with external expectations. The lack of sufficient breaks—particularly surrounding the summer term—is viewed as a critical issue that may undermine both participation and effectiveness.

School of Education Comments

Cal Poly School of Education Feedback on the 27/28 AY Calendar

27/28 AY Calendar Does Not Match K-12 Calendars

Credential programs at Cal Poly are required by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to have 600 hours of clinical practice as one requirement to earn a teaching credential in California. For our credential programs, these 600 hours are accrued in two terms (fall and spring).

The proposed 27/28 AY calendar reduces the number of hours many of our credential students will accrue because of the early Cal Poly January start. Three of our districts would return from their winter break ~1-2 weeks later than Cal Poly's start of spring term, reducing the number of hours for students placed at these school sites (~25 hours). During the 25/26 AY, 40% of our students were placed in these three districts. During the 24/25 AY, 60% of our students were placed in these three districts. Although we anticipate that they will be able to meet their required hours, the Learn by Doing experience will be qualitatively different for these students.

Another challenge of the proposed 27/28 AY calendar is our credential students will conclude their clinical practice in April rather than May, limiting their ability to stay until almost the end of the district's school year. April is also a month when numerous state exams occur, providing our credential students with less instructional time during their clinical practice experience.

We also have concerns about the impact these consecutive years of changes may have on our K-12 district partners. Our district partners will be adjusting as we make the switch from quarters to semesters for the 26/27 AY and then will need to adjust again for the 27/28 AY (if the current proposed calendar is implemented). With the anticipation of YRO requiring a different calendar for 28/29 AY, our districts will have had four years of shifts to the credential students' clinical practice schedule. These changes may impact the School of Education's ability to recruit mentor teachers to host our credential students.

Summer Term for the 27/28 AY Calendar

Maintaining a shorter summer term session is essential to continuing to be able to recruit for our graduate and credential programs. Two of our master's degree programs (Curriculum and Instruction and Education Leadership and Administration) end their program in summer and rely on a 5-week summer session immediately after the conclusion of spring term. A summer term ending in mid-August would be detrimental to students completing these graduate programs since they would be unable to apply for administrative positions for the following academic year.

since their degree would not be awarded before the start of the K-12 school year. A 5- or 7-week summer session immediately after spring term is critical for these two graduate programs.

Our single subject credential program begins their program in summer and relies on a 5-week summer session immediately before fall term. Since an undergraduate degree is required before a student can enroll in a credential program, a summer that begins in May prior to all other CSUs and UCs finishing their terms would be detrimental to the single subject program's enrollment numbers and the demographics of the single subject program. A 5- or 7-week summer session right before the start of fall term is critical for this credential program.

Shortened Breaks in Between Terms

We have concerns about the shortened breaks and the impact to faculty, staff, and student wellbeing. No longer having a full-week break in fall (proposed as 3 days for students and 2 days for faculty), having a 2.5-week break from fall to spring for faculty, and no break from spring to summer is challenging in terms of preparing for the next term and feeling rested to take on the new term.

In the School of Education, two of our one-year graduate programs have a fall, spring, summer required course sequence. In the School of Education, we have 13 tenure-track faculty, and 5 of those 13 faculty will be teaching all three terms.

These shortened breaks also create a challenge for the workload of staff since the end and beginning of terms typically see an increase in workload associated with scheduling and enrollment, contracts, mileage reimbursement, and more.

Recommendation

The School of Education recommends implementing a 27/28 AY calendar that mirrors that of the 26/27 AY calendar. Giving us two years of the same academic calendar will reduce the number of changes that will impact the Learn by Doing experiences that occur in our K-12 schools. It also will allow faculty, staff, students, and district partners to have consistency for two years, which is much needed after needing to pivot because of the pandemic and the transition to semesters. These two years will also allow us to better understand what the YRO 28/29 AY calendar may look like, and with resources provided by the university, engage in program and curricular revisions to ensure that the robust Learn by Doing experiences are maintained and that faculty, staff, and student wellbeing is prioritized.



MEMORANDUM

April 22, 2026

TO: Academic Senate Instruction Committee

FROM: Brian Horgan, Dean, College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences

SUBJECT: CAFES Faculty Comments Re: Proposed 2027-2028 Academic Calendar

Faculty feedback from all CAFES departments to the proposed 2027-2028 academic calendar was gathered through department heads and is summarized below.

In general, feedback reflects a consistent set of concerns. While there is general understanding of the original intent behind the transition to semesters – particularly the goal of better alignment with other CSU campuses and community colleges – faculty widely perceive that the proposed calendar does not achieve this objective. Instead, it appears to introduce greater misalignment with partner institutions, local school districts and community colleges, creating challenges for transfer pathways, shared instruction and coordination for students and employees with caregiving responsibilities.

A primary concern is the overall pacing and structure of the calendar. Faculty consistently note that the limited breaks between terms, shortened winter recess and elimination of certain holidays result in a highly compressed schedule that may not be sustainable. The lack of sufficient turnaround time between terms raises concerns about the ability to complete grading, prepare for upcoming instruction and maintain essential administrative and operational functions. There is also uncertainty about how campus operations – including facilities maintenance and departmental work – would be effectively managed within a near year-round instructional model.

Faculty also expressed concern about the potential impact on student success and experience. The compressed schedule, combined with inconsistent term structures during the transition period, may make it more difficult for students to plan internships, participate in study abroad and engage in other high-impact learning opportunities. There is also concern that reduced or poorly timed breaks – such as a shortened Thanksgiving period – may negatively affect class attendance and overall engagement.

In addition, the proposed calendar is seen as limiting faculty capacity for research, curriculum development and program innovation, particularly given the reduced periods available for focused scholarly activity. This is compounded by ongoing changes to the academic calendar, which have made it more difficult for faculty to plan effectively and develop long-term initiatives.

Faculty also highlighted the importance of alignment with local K–12 school schedules, noting that misalignment creates practical challenges for employees with school-aged children and may have broader implications for recruitment and retention.

Finally, there is a strong interest in better understanding the rationale behind the proposed calendar, including the anticipated benefits and how the current model supports institutional priorities related to student success, faculty effectiveness and operational sustainability.

Taken together, faculty feedback suggests a need for further consideration of calendar structure, pacing, and alignment to ensure that the academic calendar supports the long-term success of students, faculty and staff.

2027-2028 Academic Calendar Feedback - CENG

Note that these comments are presented as received, without editing. Although the request was targeted at feedback on the 27-28 calendar draft, much of the feedback expanded into general comments/concerns/feedback about the broader YRO effort.

Common Themes:

- *Proposed calendar longer than an astronomical year; concern that the solution for the 2028-29 calendar will be to shorten the semesters by at least a week (with details about why the shortened semesters causes problems).*
- *Short time between semesters create problems for academic policies & processes (e.g. grading, academic notice).*
- *Short time between semesters does not provide any “recharge” time for students/staff/faculty. Saturday faculty workdays created some concern.*
- *Summer is a very productive time for equipment maintenance, facilities projects, staff catchup, etc. Full schedule during summer reduces this opportunity.*

Engineering Student Services

Academic Policies and Registrar Processes

- **Academic Notice:** How does academic notice work if the term starts, but students do not know the grades yet?
 - Especially students in **Maritime** that will be on the ship
- **Academic standing:** How will the Registrar manage academic standing appeals if the Spring term begins before Fall grades are fully audited and processed?
- **Grading:** How will final grading processes accommodate Spring May 2nd, while starting summer classes on May 3rd?
 - Faculty will have roughly **10 business days** (excluding holidays) to grade finals, submit them, and prep for a January 3 start.
- **Prerequisite Errors:** The 20-day gap between Fall end and Spring start is heavily interrupted by holidays, increasing the risk that students remain enrolled in Spring courses for which they failed the Fall prerequisites. How can we ensure this does not happen?

Admissions, Transcripts, and Readmissions

- **Transcript Verifications:** Will the Admissions office have enough time to verify final high school transcripts before the August 12 "Beginning of Term" when most high schools are finished in May or June?
 - Community colleges often don't release final transcripts until late June or July. An August 12 start gives the Registrar less than a month to verify thousands of records to prevent "disenrollment" for missing prerequisites.
- **Former Students/Readmission:** Many former students attend Open University to meet readmission requirements. Logistically speaking, it will be difficult to readmit students without having the grades prior to the next term starting.
 - The Admissions Office and Registrar's Office can take up to 3 business days to readmit a student. Therefore, students will most likely have to wait until the following semester to be readmitted, which may mean they do not return to Cal Poly to complete their degree.

Financial Aid and Enrollment Overlap

- **Financial aid:** Does the August 12 start date conflict with the "Census Date" requirements for state or federal funding?
 - Are the Summer 2028 dates (ending August 22) going to overlap with the start of the Fall 2028 term, potentially creating a "double-processing" issue for Financial Aid?
 - **Summer-to-Fall Transition:** The Summer term ends **August 22**, but the Fall term starts **August 12**. Does this overlap require students to be enrolled in two different financial aid "years" simultaneously? How will the system handle students overlapping a Summer final exam with a Fall first day of class?

Housing and Cost of Living

- **Housing availability and cost:** Most leases are signed in winter/early spring in the SLO area for a full year. How do we expect students to find housing for their proper terms when it will not coincide with these social norms of San Luis Obispo?
 - Sure, we are consistently building more on-campus housing, but it is always more expensive than living off campus; worse conditions and overall provides less autonomy to their lives.
 - **On-campus housing isn't viable for every student at Cal Poly.**

Course Availability and Scheduling Conflicts

- **Course offerings:** What happens to course offerings when too many professors want the same term off? Are they going to be limited in their term off and now must change their lifestyles to match the students? Will there just be less course offerings during certain terms and students of that cycle will have less chances to graduate in a timely manner?
- **Term preferences create demand:** What if more students opt-in to certain terms than professors? How will the university/admissions manage matching supply/demand?

Student Experience, Well-being, and Development

- **Students don't have time to recharge:** How are we promoting student development and growth when the students do not have the time to process or rest? The moment they are done with their stressful finals, they have to pay for new materials and start right back at the beginning.
- **Loss of a consistent long break:** Even if students only take 2 of 3 terms, the year-round structure removes the shared, predictable summer break. Students may still struggle to find a continuous 10–12-week window for rest, travel, or personal growth.
- **Increased burnout for students:** Without a universal long break, students may take shorter, scattered time off instead of a true reset. This can lead to cumulative fatigue over multiple years.
- **Students who struggle with mental health or have learning disabilities may not be able to cope well with year-round operation:** This can lead to more ITO, leaves of absence or university departures if their needs are not met.

Career Outcomes and Internships

- **Harder to get internships:** Internship cycles are built around a traditional May–August summer, but students' "off term" may not align with that window. This mismatch can make students less competitive or force them to skip valuable opportunities.
- **Harder to get jobs post-grad:** Moving forward, there will be a larger number of students projected to graduate in the fall term. With new job postings typically listed around December and the following January, are we now giving them more opportunities for employment compared to our Spring graduates? Will Spring graduates lose opportunities because their peers that came in at a different time are being offered those opportunities first?

Equity, Admissions, and Student Stratification

- **Creation of a status hierarchy based on start term:** If better applicants get first pick and most prefer fall, fall-start students will be seen as “top tier.” This can create lasting perceptions of superiority and inferiority among students.
- **Admission Inequities:** How will first-pick for start terms be decided equitably? IE: football player vs. academic achiever. Or women’s sports players vs. men's?
- **Unequal access to opportunities:** Some opportunities (internships, research, leadership roles) are seasonal or tied to specific terms. Students whose schedules don’t align may miss out or face limited options.

Campus Culture, Social Life, and Athletics

- **Social fragmentation between cohorts:** Fall-start students form the initial social and academic networks, while later-start students join after groups are already established. This can lead to **exclusion and a weaker sense of belonging.**
- **Damage to campus unity and identity:** Instead of one cohesive class, students become divided into start-term groups. This can weaken school spirit and create unnecessary divisions.
- **Sports are seasonal:** will students be admitted to a term depending on what sport they play?

Facilities, Maintenance, and Operations

- **Custodial staff relies on summer:** The custodial staff on campus relies on summer to execute larger cleaning projects and ensure it is ready for students in the fall. Are they also expected to work more without any compensation?
- **Maintenance:** How will maintenance be handled with continuous occupancy in buildings?
- **Housing/Move-in turnaround time:** The May 2/May 3 transition makes it impossible to flip student housing between Spring and Summer residents without staggered move-ins.

Staffing, Workload, and Burnout

- How are staff supposed to recharge mental batteries/avoid **burnout and quiet-quitting** if they are going from one term to another within a day?
- **Is Cal Poly going to hire more staff employees to help out?** If we are always short in budgets, how can we possibly cover what needs to be done with the staff we currently have?
- **“Breaks” for staff are not BREAKS from work.** They allow time to do all the things that there isn’t enough time for during the academic year.

- **Staff Burnout:** The lack of a "bridge" between Spring and Summer, combined with a January 3rd start, means advising staff will have very few periods of low-intensity work. How will staff be supported?

Faculty and Employee Retention / Work Conditions

- **Staff already worried and looking at other employment:** “Seeing this calendar prompted me to look at other university openings – I do not feel like my department is being considered at all, and other universities are not taking this action.”
- Many of our staff and faculty rely on the relaxed nature of summer to catch up on work but also be more involved in their children’s lives. With year-round operations, **are we expected to find other ways of having our children taken care of without any expectations of a raise or similar compensation?**
- **Risk of losing prestigious faculty:** Top professors often choose institutions that offer a traditional academic rhythm with summers off. A year-round expectation makes it harder to recruit and retain high-quality faculty.

Departmental Operations and Advising Capacity

- Change of major (**ICMAs**) are also processed during transitional time and this **will create a staffing issue at a crucial advising time** during the beginning of the term.
- Our department (**ESS**) **relies on summer and winter for data assessment and larger projects, as well as orientation.** We will not have the staffing to manage transfer orientation and maintain regular advising levels for continuing students required to be enrolled in summer.
- **Faculty Availability:** With rotating faculty schedules, how will students be supported when their faculty advisor or mentor is away during a term students need to discuss/plan senior projects and/or graduate school/blended program applications?
- **Advising:** Planning for processes related to academic advising happens during less busy times over summer, will advising centers be allotted times for planning during “year-round operations” when students need staff year-round? Will additional staff be hired to support continuous student needs/support?

Electrical Engineering

Questions:

1. The duration of the proposed academic calendar seems to exceed the duration of an astronomical year by 10 days (starts on Aug. 12, 2027 and finishes on Aug. 22, 2028).

What does this mean for the subsequent AY (2028-29)? Please work out at least 2 years of YRO (2027-28 & 2028-29) before finalizing the 2027-28 calendar.

2. Five Saturdays are listed as faculty workdays. What implications does this have for contacts?
3. Does the proposed calendar mean that YRO has been approved? Is a supermajority vote from faculty sufficient for our program to opt out of YRO, or do we need a unanimous decision?
4. Where will the teaching capacity come from?
 - There will be tremendous pressure on hiring committees to accept sub-par candidates.
 - The pool of quality applicants will shrink even further when news of this scheme gets out.
5. How will self-governance/committee service work when ~30% of all members are not working at any given day of the year?
6. If 9-month faculty with school-aged children are forced to work May-August, the demand for childcare during those months will go up. What is the University going to do about this?
7. For individuals like myself, I value having the summer off, as my wife is a teacher and that is the time we have for vacation. Would lecturers—or any faculty—be able to choose their schedules? If so, what would happen if most prefer to work in the fall and spring, resulting in a shortfall during the summer? Would we be required to accept a different schedule?
8. Is the Graduate Program a part of the YRO?
9. Will each faculty member have to teach only 2 terms? Will they be allowed to pick which terms? How would that work? I think our feedback depends on those factors. If anyone wants to teach all 3 terms will they get extra salary? Will there be enough students to run classes in all 3 terms?
10. How will the hiring of student helpers/graders work for the summer term? If there are no qualified upper-class students, does this mean that faculty will need to do the grading themselves (including the grading of homework and pre-labs)?
11. Due to poor ventilation and air conditioning, our building (Building 20) cannot support summer instruction. Will the university allocate money to fix the issue? When?

Comments/Concerns

1. The proposed academic calendar cannot be properly evaluated. We need information about class scheduling & registration deadlines. Without such information we cannot determine the impact on administrative staff, Dept. chairs, and schedulers.
2. The break between Spring and Summer term is impossibly short (if faculty are expected to empty their offices so that their “summer colleagues” can move in).
3. Risk of shortened semester duration on our ABET Engineering accreditation
 - ABET typically expects a minimum of 15 weeks of instruction per semester
2. Negative impact on students
 - loss of summer internship opportunities
 - NOTE: major corporations typically have large internship programs over SUMMER ONLY
 - reduced club participation (esp. In once-per-year competitions in Fall/Spring)
 - NOTE: 80% of engineering students believe YRO will negatively impact them (ref: Mustang news article)
3. Negative impact on faculty / creation of two-tiered system negatively impacts students
 - most tenured faculty will retain their current schedule and not teach summer
 - summer will primarily be taught by new faculty (hired under YRO) and lecturers, esp. those on H1 visas who are ineligible for other summer jobs.
 - Students on a summer schedule will have less instruction by tenured faculty
4. Negative impact of faculty recruitment
 - Cal Poly will be unique in California in contractually requiring new faculty to teach over summer
 - This is another negative attribute for Cal Poly, in addition to the high cost of housing and lack of local industry to support spousal employment or additional faculty research (or outside employment)
5. Impact on equipment/facilities
 - summer is typically used for equipment and lab repair/refurb, YRO forces this to be concurrent with instruction

- 50% increase in equipment usage will result in faster wear out and increase in repair/replacement costs

6. Unnecessary & Excessive Cost / Poor Cost Benefit Ratio

- Student who take >4 years to graduate in our program (50%) typically fall behind in one or more critical "choke point" classes

- We can effectively increase our graduation rates (throughput) by using summer to re-offer these critical classes, allowing students to catch-up

- Offering select, critical classes over the summer has a much lower cost and impact than YRO

- YRO increases CAPACITY but not THROUGHPUT

7. The schedule is acceptable for year-around operations if equal-length semesters are mandated from the President's office. I would still prefer a shorter, more concentrated summer semester. The number of departments that can support year-around operations from an enrollment point of view is limited. Therefore, the number of students in the summer quarter will always be much smaller than the fall and spring semesters. It would make sense therefore to have a more concentrated summer semester. This shorter summer semester also enables students to have more time available for traditional summer activities (like family vacations).

8. Students should be able to choose their Fall Semester, Spring Semester, and Summer Semester pattern options so they can optimize for their needs. I feel mandating semester patterns will ultimately be a policy that will diminish student success at Cal Poly.

9. Having spent a lot of time in industry working with universities, this calendar would seem to disadvantage those students in session during the summer. Most industry internships - which, I think, is more critical for landing a full-time position in engineering - are in the summer. Moreover, major recruiting events usually occur in the fall, which would disadvantage those students who miss that semester. Not sure that the workaround for that is. Industry is not likely to change.

10. The proposed calendar supports tracks-based YRO. It is a very small and the most mundane part of YRO. CP administration should emphasize the critical aspects of YRO operation: faculty assignment policies, sub-cohort formation and enforcement, triple-cohorts tracking and class scheduling, offices assignments and hoteling, staff working conditions, shared governance, faculty committees, CC, PRC, etc.

Materials Engineering

1. Not having a break between Spring and Summer semesters is ridiculous. Faculty won't have time to prep for courses if they are teaching in both semesters.
2. Only two days for Thanksgiving is inappropriate as students will be traveling late on Wednesday night to get home. Faculty will likely end up canceling a lot of classes during that week anyway.
3. This schedule doesn't seem to be aligned with community colleges, which was heavily touted as the motivation to go year round. Most schools with a semester calendar have a longer winter break and a slightly shorter summer semester. This calendar looks like quarter timing except that the "Spring Quarter" has turned into something that takes the whole summer. This schedule will leave non downtime for instrument repair, course improvements, or infrastructure updates without substantially impacting student experience. This schedule feels disrespectful to the hard work that faculty do in the downtime and eliminates the opportunity to modify labs between sessions.
4. Really dislike starting so early in Aug and ending May 2, particularly with less time off between the semesters than we currently have in quarters and losing the whole week at Thanksgiving. One of the best things about quarters was starting late in September. With our lack of AC in all buildings, the hot days of August will be very unpleasant.
5. I dislike this 2027-28 calendar. If the breaks between terms are evenly spaced out, there should be a ~3-week break between each of the terms. There is practically no break between the Spring 2028 and Summer 2028 terms. Faculty who are teaching both the Spring 2028 and Summer 2028 terms will be exhausted during the Summer 2028 term, and this can affect the quality of their teaching. What happened to the mid-February President's Day holiday? Has the Solano campus been consulted in developing this calendar? Does this proposed calendar work for them?

Computer Science

For this specific calendar, the extremely short "breaks" between terms (Spring to Summer and Summer to Fall) are concerning for both students and faculty that will be in session during those transitions (which is not uncommon outside of YRO, with faculty teaching for additional compensation and students taking additional courses to progress).

Most significant, because they do not have a choice about terms, is the impact of these short breaks on staff and, especially, advising. It appears that students might not know if they have passed a prerequisite until the day before the next course begins. This carries

the potential to impact department staff and advising as students scramble to adjust schedules.

The sliding start date for each subsequent Fall is clearly an issue but is also obviously based on an anticipated reduction in the number of weeks per semester to support YRO.

Concerns have been expressed about the lack of air conditioning across campus in general given the early start, but that is an artifact of semesters as much as anything and then comes off as a critique of YRO more generally than about this specific calendar.

Biomedical Engineering

Positive

- The inclusion of ~15-week semesters + finals was appreciated.

Negative/concerns:

- Maritime Port restrictions were mentioned as influencing the planning process, but it's not clear why the San Luis Obispo and Solano campuses need to be on the same calendar.
- **The turnaround between Summer and Fall was a major concern** – not only is Fall conference week condensed to 3 days (which would make it difficult to include the preparatory meetings, retreats, orientations, etc.) but this turnaround is insufficient for faculty who teach in the Summer Term to prepare for Fall quarter. This may also prevent faculty from wanting to teach over Summer, which is contradictory to what we would need on YRO.
- In the Fall of '27, **running classes through Wednesday before Thanksgiving was a concern**, as it does not give students much time to return home for the Thanksgiving holiday. Faculty commented that this will lead to significant truancy for Wednesday classes (and likely Mon/Tues classes that week also). Faculty were also concerned about rushed travel on Wednesday afternoon/evening, which is more likely to produce unsafe driving (*faculty recollection is that Cal Poly started giving Wednesday off in the 90s after a student was involved in a fatal car accident rushing home for Thanksgiving*).
- The short winter break and proposed January 3rd start date for Spring Term would keep us **off cycle with all the other CSUs, contradicting one of the three goals of the semester conversation as stated by the Chancellor's**

Office, and will continue to challenge our participation in system-wide events, such as the CSU Biotech Symposium

- The overall **Jan 3 – Apr 28 schedule for Spring was noted to potentially cause problems for summer opportunities**, which typically don't start that early (e.g. internships, REUs, study abroad, etc).
- Spring Break was proposed to be “late” in the term – i.e. about 10 weeks into the term, as opposed to closer to the middle of the term. There was concern that this **imbalance would negatively affect the delivery of the curriculum**.
- The **1-day break between Spring '28 and Summer '28 terms is insufficient for the preparation of high-quality curriculum**, and will lead to a lower-quality curriculum in the summer
- The **condensed turnaround between Spring/Summer and Summer/Fall was a major concern for faculty and student mental health** – getting no break between Jan-August and/or faculty burnout for faculty who teach Spring and Summer and/or who roll right into Fall.
- Being **off-cycle in all aspects described above may pose challenges to those faculty that need to find childcare** but aren't aligned with typical childcare offerings. e.g. Spring break week appears to be unusual, and in Fall local schools will likely start the week after our term starts, etc.
- It appears that the proposal, if repeated long-term, would lead to a **53.5 week calendar, which is impossible** and means that subsequent terms would get affected.

Civil and Environmental Engineering

- The academic calendar has lined up nicely over the last few years with local school districts (e.g. SLCUSD) so that Spring break and Thanksgiving break for parents align with the school-age children. We hope that this feature can be retained in the new calendar.
- Taking away Thanksgiving's week-long break will bring back the issue of sparsely attended classes and be particularly harmful for out-of-state students.
- Lack of time off between terms.

Mechanical Engineering

1. Compression of Instructional Time

Faculty expressed significant concern about the reduction in instructional days, particularly in the summer term. While Fall 2027 (73 days) and Spring 2028 (72 days) remain near current norms, Summer 2028 drops to 69 instructional days—below the equivalent of a 14-week semester. This raises concerns about a gradual shift toward shortened terms (approaching ~13.5 weeks), which may reduce course content coverage and disproportionately impact lab-based and hands-on courses central to ME pedagogy. Several faculty emphasized that further compression (e.g., a 10% reduction in term length) would be difficult to accommodate without compromising instructional quality.

2. Lack of Clarity on Long-Term YRO Structure

Faculty noted uncertainty about whether the reduced instructional days in Summer 2028 represent a transitional anomaly or a new long-term standard. There is a strong desire for clearer guidance on the anticipated steady-state YRO calendar (e.g., 2028–2029 and beyond), particularly regarding whether ~69-day semesters will become the norm. This uncertainty complicates curriculum planning and long-term course design.

3. Calendar Structure and Break Placement

Faculty emphasized that well-placed breaks are more beneficial than longer but poorly timed ones for both student performance and instructor effectiveness. Several issues were raised regarding the timing and distribution of breaks:

- **Thanksgiving Week:** The return to only two official holidays (Thursday and Friday) is viewed by about half the respondents as problematic, as attendance during the surrounding instructional days is historically low, effectively creating a “lost week.”
- **Spring Break Timing:** The proposed placement in Week 10 is seen as suboptimal, with faculty recommending a mid-semester break (around Week 7–8) to better support student pacing and learning.
- **Long Fall Stretch:** Faculty noted a lack of breaks between Labor Day and Veterans Day, contributing to fatigue, and suggested consideration of a short fall break in October.

4. Inconsistent Term Start Dates and Academic Rhythm

The proposed calendar introduces variability in start dates (e.g., August 18 in 2027 vs. August 23 in 2028) and winter break duration (e.g., Spring starting January 4 vs. January 25 in prior years). Faculty noted that such inconsistency disrupts planning and creates uneven academic pacing for both students and instructors.

5. Transition Between Spring and Summer Terms

A major operational concern is the extremely short transition between Spring and Summer 2028. With grades due May 2 and summer classes beginning May 4, faculty would have effectively one day to transition between terms. This raises concerns about course preparation, grading workload, and the sustainability of teaching consecutive terms under YRO.

6. Impact on Students—Internships and Experiential Learning

Faculty raised strong concerns about the impact of YRO on student internships, particularly in Mechanical Engineering, where summer internships are the dominant model. The proposed structure may force some students into summer enrollment, limiting access to these opportunities. Faculty noted

that this may contradict earlier messaging that semester conversion would enhance internship access and could disadvantage ME students in a competitive job market.

7. Need for Data-Driven Decision Making

Several faculty emphasized that many concerns are currently anecdotal and recommended a more formal, data-driven evaluation of YRO impacts—particularly regarding instructional effectiveness, student outcomes, and employer expectations. Suggestions included surveying industry partners and benchmarking peer institutions operating on year-round calendars.

8. General Observations on YRO Transition

Faculty broadly recognize that the 2027–2028 calendar represents a transitional step toward full YRO implementation. However, there is concern that key structural elements—such as term length, break placement, and student pathways—have not yet been fully resolved or communicated. Some faculty noted that similar models at other institutions can work but require careful design to ensure academic rigor and student opportunity are preserved.

Summary:

ME faculty support being asked to provide departmental input and encourage continued consultation. Our most critical concerns center on:

- Preservation of sufficient instructional time (≥ 14 weeks equivalent)
- Clear communication of long-term YRO structure
- Improved placement of academic breaks
- Feasibility of term-to-term transitions for faculty
- Protection of student internship opportunities

Aerospace Engineering

1. With the proposed calendar being longer than an astronomical year, we are concerned that the solution for the 2028-29 calendar will be to shorten the fall semester by at least a week, which will result in spring and summer also being reduced by at least a week. We have a few issues here.
 - a. We already converted classes from 10- to 15-week. We find it frustrating that we are being asked to change the format of the class again even before we have taught the class one time.
 - b. This is a significant issue with lab classes. Missing one week of lab misses an entire experiment.
 - c. Going from 30-weeks of instruction on quarters to 30-weeks on semesters seems like a fair trade. But we don't see how the university (and the faculty) can justify going to a shorter semester. Even one week of instruction over eight semesters is an eight-week reduction in student/faculty time. That is over half a semester. I would think students those that are paying tuition would expect some sort of reduction in price.

- d. Going to a shorter semester and saying things like, "we can just condense the class" shows how much the administration does not value the work of the faculty in our daily interaction with students.
2. We still cannot understand how and why the calendar would propose so many Saturday workdays. That is a change in working conditions, and we have seen no evidence the administration has consulted with the CFA with regard to this change. Are department chairs really going to reprimand everyone that does not show up for work on those Saturdays? Will that end up in RPT evaluations? We would think students or someone else paying tuition might expect a reduction in tuition to justify the lost instructional days.

Subject: Re: Reminder: 2027-2028 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 at 3:56:19 PM Pacific Daylight Time
From: Robert S. Crockett
To: Academic Calendar
CC: Al Liddicoat, Office of the Provost

Hi Michele -

One late submission, representing the engineering programs at Cal Poly Maritime. It is a long and highly detailed narrative, but the point I want to highlight is:

Lowering the number of instructional weeks to 14 weeks would require approval by the USCG...**Should leadership plan semesters based on a nominal 14 weeks or fewer of instruction, it is imperative to first consult the USCG as soon as possible to understand how this would impact program approval. This would need to be done at the Superintendent or President level.**

Calendar Alignment with Cal Maritime's Prior Calendar Structure

As a general observation, the academic calendar draft presented is similar to past Cal Maritime calendars and shares many of its characteristics, including the 3-day break from instruction during the Thanksgiving week, the change in date to the observance of President's Day, and the conclusion of the semester by early May. The last point is a very positive change for this department. During the summer, our licensed faculty sail on sea training aboard the training ship for approximately 65 days. A longer summer allows them time to regroup after the conclusion of training but before the start of the Fall semester. In addition, this benefits our students who will be completing commercial sea training and internships, which last a minimum of 60 days and 56 days respectively, but whose start dates can vary depending on employer demand. We are currently dealing with the **severe challenges** associated with the shortened summer for AY 2026-27, which are substantial and may have severe financial and operational implications (for several following summer terms) and may affect instruction and graduation rates across both campuses.

USCG Approval of Semester Contact Hours Duration

Because the Fall and Spring semesters have instructional periods within the 14-15-week duration, these semesters would likely not present issues for program approval with the USCG. The International Maritime Organization's Model Courses for STCW training assessments are built around contact hours equating to a 15-week structure, and therefore, our USCG program is built on 15 weeks of instruction. For example, lecture classes meeting 3 times/week for 1 hour have a total of 45 approved contact hours. Labs meeting once/week for 2 hours have 30 approved contact hours. Labs meeting once/week for 3 hours have 45 approved contact hours, and so forth. Lowering the number of instructional weeks to 14 weeks would require approval by the USCG. Approval of the calendar change may not necessarily be granted, triggering a crippling

situation for our USCG licensed programs in Engineering Technology, Mechanical Engineering, and Marine Transportation. Since 1995, the only time the USCG granted a reduction in contact hours (10% reduction) was for the spring term in 2020. **Should leadership plan semesters based on a nominal 14 weeks or fewer of instruction, it is imperative to first consult the USCG as soon as possible to understand how this would impact program approval. This would need to be done at the Superintendent or President level.**

Impact on Instructional Content

There is general concern about allowing a semester with only 69 instructional days, given that content for semester courses is based on 15 weeks of instruction. Should this become the norm, this will have substantive effects on course delivery. For lectures, it may seem trivial to remove a week, but it requires careful consideration for courses that serve as prerequisites. For classes with projects, this change could be disruptive, as the loss of a week may require a redesign of the assignment or its removal if it does not fit within the revised timeline. For laboratory courses, it may result in the removal of a lab experience, which is challenging given that our labs are often where students experience applied learning and complete practical STCW assessments. Above all, pedagogical changes should be driven by assessment and evaluation rather than calendar constraints. The question of a shorter semester would need to be supported by evidence that students can meet the necessary course learning outcomes with fewer contact hours.

Instructional Days Requirements

The proposed calendar has 73 instructional days and 72 instructional days for the Fall and Spring terms, respectively, which amount to approximately 14 and a half weeks of instruction per term. For comparison, in AY 2025-26, Cal Maritime had 75 instructional days and 72 instructional days in Fall 25 and Spring 26, respectively. In the past, the guidance we have used for Maritime is that the CBA requires 145-149 instructional days per academic year. This range seems to appear in documents across the system ([Chico](#), [Channel Islands](#), [Stanislaus](#), [East Bay](#)), although I can't seem to find an actual document from the CO. However, in the [Cal Poly Campus Administrative Policies](#), Chapter 211: Academic Calendar, Section 1: Instructional and Faculty Work Days, it does state that:

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 academic workdays in the academic year. There shall be a maximum of 180 workdays in the academic year.

It seems as though a student or faculty on Spring+Summer or Summer+Fall would only have 141-142 instructional days per academic year. It is not clear whether this is a one-time exception we are seeking from the Chancellor's Office or if it will be ongoing. It seems this question should be addressed prior to approval (perhaps with a release of a draft AY 28-29 calendar to envision what

the nominal YRO based calendar would look like).

Concerns with Transitions Between Semesters

While we are used to the short transition between the Fall to Spring and Spring to Summer semesters, it was not without an intense workload by the Registrar's Office, University Advising, and USCG Licensing Programs. These units processed grades, removed students who failed pre-requisites, identified students subject to Academic Dismissal, conferred academic completion and degrees, facilitated licensure exams and distribution of Officer-level credentials, and carried out other related processes in a very short amount of time. For example, this week the grade deadline is Friday, May 1st at 12:00pm and graduation is Saturday, May 2nd, meaning this processing will need to occur Friday afternoon. At Cal Maritime, this was possible due to the processes, which are less rigid than those of Cal Poly, and the number of students involved. I am concerned that scaling this up to cover the entire university would involve a substantial increase in the workload of the Registrar's Office and on ESS. I also worry about rigidity in the policies and workflow, resulting in situations such as students being dropped from courses due to failing a pre-requisite weeks into the semester or, alternatively, using the situation to bypass a pre-requisite, which, if it occurs often enough, could be an issue with respect to [Criterion 1 for ABET accredited programs](#).

From: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 11:46 AM
To: Robert S. Crockett <rcrocket@calpoly.edu>
Subject: Re: Reminder: 2027-2028 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested

Thank you, Bob.

Best,
Michele Kekaha
Associate Registrar
Office of the Registrar
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA

[university scheduling](#) 805-756-2461
[event scheduling](#) 805-756-5550
www.registrar.calpoly.edu

From: Robert S. Crockett <rcrocket@calpoly.edu>
Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2026 at 9:42 AM
To: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>
Cc: Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>; Office of the Provost <provost@calpoly.edu>
Subject: Re: Reminder: 2027-2028 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested

Good Morning!

Attached is a collection of feedback from College of Engineering. Note that these comments are presented as received, without editing. Although the request was targeted at feedback on the 27-28 calendar draft, much of the feedback expanded into general comments / concerns / feedback about the broader YRO effort. While I have listed a few common themes below, I would strongly encourage reading the entire document, as there is value in some of the detailed concerns, especially from our Engineering Student Services unit identifying policy & process challenges created by the calendar that would need to be addressed.

Common Themes:

Proposed calendar longer than an astronomical year; concern that the solution for the 2028-29 calendar will be to shorten the semesters by at least a week (with details about why the shortened semesters causes problems).

Short time between semesters create problems for academic policies & processes (e.g. grading, academic notice).

Short time between semesters does not provide any "recharge" time for students/staff/faculty. Saturday faculty workdays created some concern.

Summer is a very productive time for equipment maintenance, facilities projects, staff catchup, etc. Full schedule during summer reduces this opportunity.

Thanks!

Bob

*Robert Crockett
Dean, College of Engineering (Interim)
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo, CA
[linkedin.com/in/rscrockett](https://www.linkedin.com/in/rscrockett)*

From: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>

Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2026 5:11 PM

To: Kate Murphy <ksmurphy@calpoly.edu>; Brian Patrick Horgan <bhorgan@calpoly.edu>; Marc T. Swackhamer <mswackha@calpoly.edu>; Dean E. Wendt <dwendt@calpoly.edu>; Robert S. Crockett <rcrocket@calpoly.edu>; ASI President <asipresident@calpoly.edu>; Kris Jankovitz <kjankovi@calpoly.edu>; Terrance Leshae Harris <tharris@calpoly.edu>; Cody VanDorn <cvandorn@calpoly.edu>; Holly Clark <hclark08@calpoly.edu>; Lauren Daly <ldaly@calpoly.edu>; Natalie Rodriguez <nrodri83@calpoly.edu>; Jerusha Greenwood <jbgreenw@calpoly.edu>; Allison Ann Baird-James <abj@calpoly.edu>; Cindy Ann Pilg <cpilg@calpoly.edu>; Cook, Corey <CoCook@csu.edu>; Houston-Collins, Tari <thouston-collins@csu.edu>; Linda Ortiz <lortiz01@calpoly.edu>; Damon M. Fleming <dmf@calpoly.edu>

Cc: Jeffrey Dyer Armstrong <jarmstro@calpoly.edu>; Jennifer L. Haft <jhaft@calpoly.edu>; Amy E. Miller <amill152@calpoly.edu>; Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>; Office of the Provost <provost@calpoly.edu>; Meggan Levitt <mmlevitt@calpoly.edu>; Adrienne Layne <alayne@calpoly.edu>; Daniel Grassian <grassian@calpoly.edu>; Pinisetty, Dinesh <DPinisetty@csu.edu>; Koekemoer, Samantha <skoekemoer@csu.edu>; Cheryl May <csmay@calpoly.edu>; Michele Kekaha <mkekaha@calpoly.edu>; Cem Sunata

<csunata@calpoly.edu>

Subject: Reminder: 2027-2028 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested

Hello,

As a reminder, please review the draft 2027-2028 academic calendar and respond by April 30 with feedback from your college or organization.

Thank you,
Office of the Registrar

From: Academic Calendar <acadcal@calpoly.edu>

Date: Friday, April 3, 2026 at 4:31 PM

To: Kate Murphy <ksmurphy@calpoly.edu>, Brian Patrick Horgan <bhorgan@calpoly.edu>, Marc T. Swackhamer <mswackha@calpoly.edu>, Dean E. Wendt <dwendt@calpoly.edu>, Robert S. Crockett <rcrocket@calpoly.edu>, ASI President <asipresident@calpoly.edu>, Kris Jankovitz <kjankovi@calpoly.edu>, Terrance Leshae Harris <tharris@calpoly.edu>, Cody VanDorn <cvandorn@calpoly.edu>, Holly Clark <hclark08@calpoly.edu>, Lauren Daly <ldaly@calpoly.edu>, Natalie Rodriguez <nrodri83@calpoly.edu>, Jerusha Greenwood <jbgreenw@calpoly.edu>, Allison Ann Baird-James <abj@calpoly.edu>, Cindy Ann Pilg <cpilg@calpoly.edu>, Cook, Corey <CoCook@csu.edu>, Houston-Collins, Tari <thouston-collins@csu.edu>, Linda Ortiz <lortiz01@calpoly.edu>

Cc: Jeffrey Dyer Armstrong <jarmstro@calpoly.edu>, Jennifer L. Haft <jhaft@calpoly.edu>, Amy E. Miller <amill152@calpoly.edu>, Al Liddicoat <aliddico@calpoly.edu>, Office of the Provost <provost@calpoly.edu>, Meggan Levitt <mmlevitt@calpoly.edu>, Adrienne Layne <alayne@calpoly.edu>, Daniel Grassian <grassian@calpoly.edu>, Pinisetty, Dinesh <DPinisetty@csu.edu>, Koekemoer, Samantha <skoekemoer@csu.edu>, Cheryl May <csmay@calpoly.edu>, Michele Kekaha <mkekaha@calpoly.edu>

Subject: 2027-2028 Academic Calendar Consultation - Response Requested

Please review the attached draft 2027-2028 academic calendar and respond by April 30 with feedback from your college or organization.

- You are encouraged to solicit input from your respective departments or organization
- Request input be provided directly back to you or your designee. If it's submitted to the Office of the Registrar, then it will be redirected to you for consideration. We appreciate one summary from each college or organization.

See the attached memo for further details.

Questions may be directed to Michele Kekaha in the Office of the Registrar (mkekaha@calpoly.edu).

Thank you,
Office of the Registrar

As requested, this document contains compiled feedback from the College of Liberal Arts about the proposed 2027-2028 Academic Calendar. Below please find a concise outline and visual (AI-generated) of the feedback shared by CLA chairs. Individual responses from chairs on behalf of their departments then follow, with original wording preserved.

Major Comments (Raised Frequently)

Insufficient Breaks & Term Compression

- Repeated concern that **breaks are too short**, especially:
 - Winter/December break (significantly reduced)
 - Thanksgiving (loss of the full week break)
- **Very little or no transition time between terms** (Spring → Summer → Fall)
- Faculty emphasized impacts on:
 - Course preparation
 - Grading
 - Research productivity
 - Overall sustainability

Faculty & Student Burnout

- Strong consensus that the calendar structure is **unsustainable**
- Continuous teaching with minimal downtime leads to:
 - Faculty burnout
 - Student exhaustion and mental health concerns
- Especially problematic for:
 - Year-round teaching (YRO)
 - Multi-term instructors

Misalignment with External Schedules

- Calendar is **out of sync with**:
 - Other CSU campuses
 - Community colleges
 - K–12 school schedules
 - Internship timelines
- Consequences:
 - Reduced ability for students to take cross-campus courses
 - Internship conflicts
 - Childcare challenges
 - Recruitment disadvantages

Early Spring Start (Early January)

- January 3 start widely viewed as **too early**
- Shortens winter break and creates:
 - Unrealistic turnaround time
 - Lower course quality risk
- Most peer institutions start **mid–late January**

Lack of Clarity & Transparency

- Repeated confusion about:
 - Saturday workdays
 - Faculty workdays vs. vacation days
 - Summer session structure (self-supported courses unclear)

- Broader multi-year calendar plans
- Faculty feel they **cannot fully evaluate the proposal** without more details

Thanksgiving Break Concerns

- Loss of full week seen as problematic:
 - Expected **low attendance before holiday**
 - Ineffective instructional time
- Strong push to **restore full-week break**

Negative Impact on Teaching, Research, and Recruitment

- Reduced prep time → weaker instruction
- Reduced research time → lower productivity
- Concerns about:
 - Faculty retention
 - Hiring (especially lecturers)
 - Institutional attractiveness

Multi-Year Calendar Requests

- Desire to see **2028–29 calendar** for context

Additional Comments (Less Consistent Across Departments)

Calendar Structure Issues

- “Monday schedule on Tuesday” seen as confusing
- Particularly challenging for:
 - Neurodivergent individuals
 - Routine-dependent teaching

Summer Term Structure & Flexibility

- Desire to retain:
 - Multiple summer session formats (5-week, 7.5-week, etc.)
- Concern summer becomes:
 - Less attractive to teach
 - Less accessible to students

Childcare & Family Impact

- Misalignment with school calendars creates:
 - Childcare costs
 - Scheduling conflicts
- Particularly affects faculty and students with dependents

Holiday Naming Issue

- “César Chávez Day” should be updated to “Farmworkers Day”

Policy & Documentation Gaps

- Outdated links and unclear term-length policies

Concerns About Calendar Length/Structure

- Question of why the proposed calendar exceeds 52 weeks
- Speculation about trimester-like compression

Operational / Facilities Concerns

- Lack of downtime may:
 - Limit campus maintenance
 - Strain infrastructure

Equity & Access Concerns















- Potential impact on:
 - Transfer students (ADT pathways)
 - Cultural/religious observances (e.g., extended Christmas period for Latinx students)

Overall Takeaway

Across departments, the feedback converges on a sentiment that the proposed calendar prioritizes efficiency and symmetry at the cost of **rest, alignment, clarity, and sustainability**.

The **dominant risks identified** are:

- Burnout (faculty & students)
- Reduced instructional quality
- Misalignment with broader academic ecosystems
- Long-term harm to recruitment and retention

ISSUE CATEGORY	FREQUENCY	IMPACT
Breaks too short / compressed terms		Very High
Burnout (faculty & students)		Very High
No transition between terms		Very High
Misalignment (CSU, K-12, internships)		High
Early Spring start (Jan 3)		High
Lack of clarity / transparency		High
Thanksgiving break reduction		High
Calendar structure confusion		Moderate
Summer format concerns		Moderate
Childcare/family impacts		Moderate
Policy/technical issues		Low
Holiday naming		Low
Facilities/maintenance concerns		Low
Equity edge cases		Low

Feedback from Individual Department Chairs, on behalf of their Department

Here is the feedback from [REDACTED] faculty about the proposed calendar.

One of the main points faculty made was how close the end of the spring semester is to the start of the summer semester (the next day). Another concern is that there are working days scheduled on Saturdays.

Faculty don't know why there is no specificity about summer self-supported courses in the summer sessions (first session or second session), which makes them wonder whether self-supported summer courses are planned to be discontinued.

In addition, faculty asked about consistency with other CSU calendars and mentioned that the proposed calendar may not provide the same opportunities for internships for students.

There are also concerns about faculty, staff, and student burnout due to how close these terms are without enough breaks between academic sessions.

One final observation concerns expectations for service, particularly with regard to ongoing committee work.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed 2027-2028 calendar. Below is a synthesis of input from [REDACTED] faculty:

Concerns:

1. Alignment with K–12 and Childcare Schedules

- a. The proposed calendar creates multiple points of misalignment with local school and childcare schedules.
- b. Moving Presidents' Day from February to the fall creates conflicts for faculty with children, who will still observe the holiday in February.
- c. The early Fall 2027 start date overlaps with the start of local K–12 schedules, creating challenges during conference week and the first days of classes.
- d. Spring break and winter break are also out of sync with local districts, making it difficult for faculty to coordinate family schedules.

2. Reduction and Compression of Breaks

- a. The proposed calendar reduces total break time compared to the current schedule.
- b. Fall break and, in particular, the December break are notably shortened, with the December break reduced by roughly nine days.
- c. Faculty emphasized that this period is critical not only for rest, but for grading and course preparation.
- d. The loss of a full Thanksgiving break week was also raised as a concern, especially given expected low student engagement during that time.

3. Spring Term Start and Turnaround Time

- a. The proposed January 3 start date is seen as too early.
- b. Faculty noted that the winter break is already heavily occupied with grading and course prep, and shortening it further creates an unrealistic turnaround.
- c. This compressed timeline may negatively impact course quality and faculty well-being.

4. **Continuous Teaching Load**

- a. There is effectively no break between Spring and Summer terms, or between Summer and Fall, with grades due immediately before the next term begins.
- b. Faculty described this as unsustainable for those teaching across multiple terms and a potential barrier to staffing summer courses.
- c. Considering YRO being on the horizon, this can pose significant transition challenges for both faculty and staff teaching during Spring-Summer or Summer-Fall terms.

5. **Calendar Structure and Clarity**

- a. The practice of assigning a “Monday schedule on a Tuesday” continues to be viewed as confusing and disruptive. Faculty noted that these shifts can be especially challenging for neurodivergent folks and others who rely on consistent routines.
- b. There is also ongoing confusion about the meaning and expectations of Saturday “workdays,” as well as how faculty workdays and vacation days are calculated.

Recommendations

1. Consider **alternative holidays** (e.g., Cesar Chavez Day) rather than moving Presidents’ Day out of February.
2. Revisit start dates to better align with local school schedules and peer institutions.
3. Preserve a longer December break to allow adequate time for grading, course preparation, and rest.
4. Reconsider the elimination of a full Thanksgiving break week.
5. Explore alternatives to the “Monday schedule on a Tuesday” structure to reduce confusion and disruption.
6. Build in clearer transition time between Spring, Summer, and Fall terms.

Questions

1. How are faculty workdays and vacation days being calculated under the proposed calendar?
2. What is the rationale for the earlier Fall 2027 start date compared to adjacent years and peer institutions?
3. What is the intended purpose and expectation around Saturday “workdays”?
4. Are there plans to address the lack of transition time between consecutive terms, particularly for those teaching year-round?

Overall, the calendar is described as creating unnecessary strain, particularly for parents and those teaching year-round. There is a broader concern that the structure prioritizes efficiency while increasing inconvenience, with possible implications for morale, retention, and instructional quality.

Please find below the [REDACTED] Department faculty feedback on the proposed 2027-28 Catalog.

Comment 1

The calendar appears to be using the now obsolete name César Chávez Day for the holiday at the end of March which has been renamed to Farmworkers Day. I assume the registrar and others will catch this, but I’m sending this little comment along, just in case.

Comment 2

The turnaround time between semesters is very short, so course prep will be very challenging (excluding winter break). The link to the policy (Campus Administrative Policy 211 (<http://policy.calpoly.edu/cap/200/cap210.htm>) from the Registrar's memo has not been updated to reflect semesters, so the minimum days of each term/semester (48-49 days per quarter) is difficult to determine. I'm sure this has been defined in other documents but the lack of consistency and clarity is troubling and makes offering feedback on the calendar more difficult. One upshot is that come summer 2028, it appears for those still on a traditional academic year schedule, the lost month of 2027 summer break will be made up to an extent with a three and a half month summer break.

Comment 3

IT IS AWFUL. There will be NO meaningful break between fall and spring semesters! That makes the slog between those semesters even worse (and significantly longer) than the exhausting current slog of winter and spring quarters without faculty having a meaningful break between them! Spring semester should start no earlier than mid-January, and preferably in late January, as is the case in most semester institutions.

Comment 4

It's difficult to offer comments without knowing how YRO will impact 10-month work assignments and the staffing of summer term. Just on the face of it, a longer winter break would be preferable between Fall/Spring. If some faculty are teaching Spring/Summer or Summer/Fall, this calendar looks completely unsustainable for delivering quality instruction over the course of the AY, as there are no breaks between those terms.

And if there's an option for faculty to earn additional compensation for summer teaching as we do now (essentially teaching all three terms in an AY), the timing of the terms looks even worse. There would be only 18 days off (during winter break 2027) between August 12, 2027 and August 22, 2028. I assume those faculty would then not be teaching in Fall 2028, or else they would essentially be teaching without any break from January 3, 2028 until mid-December 2028.

Thank you for coordinating the CLA feedback process on the proposed 2027-28 academic calendar. Below is the consolidated response from the [REDACTED] Department.

The department received one faculty response. That respondent raised two concerns:

1. Thanksgiving break. The two-day Thanksgiving break is expected to produce significant absenteeism on the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday preceding the holiday. The respondent requested that Thanksgiving break be extended to a full week, consistent with prior practice.
2. Presidents' Day. The respondent expressed concern about moving Presidents' Day from February to November 26 (in place of a fall break day), and requested that it be restored to its traditional February observance.

The respondent rated the overall calendar as presenting "significant concerns."

I have two feedback points to share from [REDACTED] faculty:

1. For the Summer schedule and alternative term lengths, we want to make sure that in addition to the semester offering for Summer 2028 (and future Summers), we will continue to offer the shorter sessions (e.g. 5-week, 7.5 week, or 10-week, etc) to allow for Summer flexibility. Multiple options for Summer will be an important approach for our students, instructors, and programs (our MS program especially).
 2. Fall break: holding class on Monday and Tuesday of the Thanksgiving week may lead to problems that we experienced several years back before we started having the whole week as a holiday. This may be unavoidable due to the logistics of finding the right number of instructional days on this new calendar, but it will be good to at least be prepared for the likelihood of a majority of students not attending class during Thanksgiving week. If we cannot plan any pedagogically important activities the days before Thanksgiving, there may be a need for some kind of consistent recommendations around use of canvas or alternative activities during a week when we will see very low attendance.
-

The [REDACTED] Dept. faculty have provided some feedback on the draft academic calendar for 2027-28.

- We would want to know what the 2028-29 calendar might be, given the later start date for classes proposed for Fall 2028. Multiple years of calendars provide more context for the nearer year that is up for consideration.
 - We were very concerned about the very limited break time for faculty through the 2027-28 AY and into the Fall of 2028 (such as we can guess about it from the start date listed in this draft of 2027-28).
 - The shift to a later start date for Fall 2028 suggests a change to shorter trimester terms without actually stating such a shift. We wondered what a full AY calendar for 2028-29 might be if we don't compress all three terms for trimesters.
 - The issue about seeing some range of possibilities for multiple years of calendars can be easily seen by some computational means of calculating sequences of calendars aiming at an average of 71.5 or so of instructional days working around hard limits on some holidays.
 - Clarity about whether we will move to 13.5 instructional week trimesters would help determine the strength of the concerns about the breaks between terms.
-

I'm writing to provide the [REDACTED] Department's feedback on the proposed 2027-28 academic calendar.

[REDACTED] faculty generally agree that the calendar as proposed has all of the drawbacks of the current quarter calendar with few of its benefits, with some of the following specific issues/questions:

Reduction of overall semester length to achieve three symmetrical terms raised many questions about impacts on curriculum (course content, classroom engagements, assessment methods, course scaffolding are all points that came up). I know this question has been raised, but I/we don't have a clear sense of what, if any, plans there are to address these impacts. If I have simply missed something on that point, my apologies.

The shortened break at Thanksgiving, along with timing of breaks overall, may create greater childcare challenges for faculty who are parents. In addition, all faculty were alarmed to note that the break between fall and spring semesters as proposed will be as short as (or shorter than) the current break between fall and winter quarters.

Part-time lecturers who work at multiple CSU campuses were hopeful that semester conversion would align their work calendars across campuses more closely, but this proposed calendar means that will again not be the case starting in 2027-28. Relatedly, I have been wondering about the possibility of hiring additional part-time lecturers from other CSU campuses, given what I am assuming will be a significant increase in demand for GE classes on YRO, but that no longer seems like a viable option with this proposed academic calendar.

How will the proposed calendar impact ADT-based admissions? For instance, given the ways the proposed calendar projects a summer start before the end of the spring semester at most other universities, including the community colleges, does this mean that summer start admissions will not be available to transfer students? While [REDACTED] faculty understand that [REDACTED] will likely not be one with summer start admissions, they still raised this point as an equity concern.

Faculty are already asking about expectations for service work during the summer; I know this question has also been asked previously, with some general responses. Now that this calendar seems like a foregone conclusion, faculty want more details.

Can faculty assume that a version of this symmetrical calendar will also be the case for 2028-29? I know the academic calendar input process will proceed per policy for all future proposed academic calendars, but faculty are already asking this question.

Several faculty also said that the proposed calendar would make teaching in the summer less appealing to them, and some suggested it might make teaching at Cal Poly unappealing regardless of term. Overall, [REDACTED] faculty think that this calendar will accelerate faculty and student burnout, which is a source of significant concern for all of us.

Here is the feedback from [REDACTED] regarding the proposed academic calendar:

First, faculty raised concerns regarding holidays. In place of a full Fall Break, there are only two days off for Thanksgiving (Nov 25th and 26th), and only four academic holidays in total. This does not resemble how Semesters are typically scheduled across the CSU system.

Second, Spring semester begins unusually early. While we have been told this is to correspond with the Maritime calendar, in most past Maritime calendars, the semester start date isn't immediately before the first day of instruction (as it is here), but is offset to provide a week or so for the coast guard exams before a mid-January start for classes. We may be harming Maritime students and Maritime transition by having classes start while they are in the middle of their coast guard exams.

Third, there are only three weeks of break between Fall semester and Spring semester on this calendar. This is a more normal break pattern for the quarter system, but highly unusual for semesters. By way of comparison, the 2027-28 calendar for Cal State LA ends December 22nd and starts up again January 24th (giving an entire month between). Almost every university that uses semesters will start Spring in

mid or late January. This means that we will be significantly out of synch with the rest of the CSU system (as is the case with the proposed holidays), making it impossible for our students to take classes at other CSU campuses or other CSU students to take classes with us.

Fourth, the Spring 28 end of term is May 2nd. Summer starts May 3rd, with Summer classes starting May 4th. The transition from Summer to Fall is similarly tight (ending August 22nd and starting classes again August 28th). If this schedule is meant to represent how breaks will work on year round operations, then we will have significant student burnout that will impact their ability to graduate, severely damaging the reputation of our campus.

Examples of year-round calendars for other college campuses operate on a quarter schedule (like Dartmouth). Students need several weeks if not more of break between semesters to rest and recover. If year round operations are feasible, it's only on a much shorter class schedule (10-12 weeks), because there simply isn't enough time to accommodate three semesters in one year.

Fifth, this schedule will likely also lead to faculty burnout. Along with those concerns, is there going to be more work placed on faculty to re-propose all of our classes to align with this new schedule?

Faculty Feedback on Proposed YR Calendar, April 2026

Students: Reduces experience in terms of rest and connection, belonging, and degree progress

- Not enough time off for rest, leading to burnout and increases in the kinds of mental health crises that the university is already struggling to address
- Latinx students celebrate Christmas through January 6th and need at least that additional week
- Summer semester doesn't align with other summer breaks in US or internationally, which may make Cal Poly much less attractive to students who want to spend their holidays with friends and siblings
- Proposed AY 27-28 calendar conflicts with approved AY 27-28 SLO Coastal Unified School District calendar, which will negatively impact students with dependents
- Early summer start and early summer end yet again jeopardizes students' ability to undertake internships
- Fall/Spring/Summer semesters don't align with other CSUs so our students won't be able to take CSU Online classes easily in ways that can help them graduate in a timely manner

University: Threat to recruitment, enrollment, and material performance of university tech/plant

- The drawbacks for students—lack of alignment with internship calendar, lack of overlap with friends and family, lack of time for community/religious observance, lack of rest—may undermine Cal Poly's strong record of student recruitment
- Odd calendar: seems to be 53 rather than 52 weeks—will the start of Fall semester keep pushing back by a year?
- Fall/Spring/Summer semesters don't align with other CSUs so other CSU students won't be able to take our online classes
- Unaligned summer means the university will miss significant summer enrollment potential, particularly in terms of international and out-of-state students
- Lack of ability to maintain IT, the roads, and overall physical plant with no times of the year when campus is more sparsely populated (other than the rainy, holiday season) will

undermine the ability to perform maintenance and lead to even more breakdowns that compromise instruction

Faculty: Additional cost & concern for caretakers, loss of course and research productivity, and threats to success and recruitment of chairs

- Proposed AY 27-28 calendar conflicts with approved AY 27-28 SLO Coastal Unified School District calendar, which will negatively impact faculty & staff with dependents (for instance, at \$30/hour for a nanny, the overlap of new term schedules with SLOCUSD will cost faculty about \$4400 in extra childcare)
- Lack of faculty prep time between terms has detrimental effects on ability to update courses, lectures, and generally stay current
- Lack of faculty research time between terms has detrimental effects on ability to complete ongoing fieldwork or archival work away from Cal Poly, and undermines research productivity
- Lack of quieter time in the year will undermine chairs'/department heads' to complete long-range administrative plans, compromising department success and reducing the likelihood of competent and enthusiastic department leadership

Recommendations

- Identify the reasons why there have been *centuries* of longer terms separated by longer breaks—intense activity followed by a period of sufficient rejuvenation—and ensure that any new calendar consciously addressed those requirements of higher education
- Keep all terms within one week of other CSUs
- Ensure winter break accommodates Latinx/Hispanic student cultural traditions
- Variable term lengths with longer class times in shorter terms
 - Fall: Aug 23 - Dec 10 (only Wed-Sun for Thanksgiving holiday)
 - Winter: Dec 11 - Fri Jan 17 (4 weeks)
 - Spring: Jan 17 – May 12 (includes a spring break week)
 - Summer: May 22 – Jul 28 (or Aug 5 if you want 10 weeks plus one for finals) – classes are 2hrs 15 mins
 - twice a week

In 2027, there is an early August start (August 12), but when you look at where Summer 2028 ends, there is a two-week difference (the end of Summer 2028 is August 22). What will the impact be of Fall 2028 starting two weeks later?



MEMORANDUM
4/28/2026

TO: Office of the Registrar
FROM: Katherine O'Clair, Interim Dean of Library Services *Katherine O'Clair*
COPIES: Office of the Provost
SUBJECT: Library Feedback on 2027-2028 Academic Calendar

Feedback from Kennedy Library Academic Services Staff and Library Faculty on the proposed 2027–2028 academic calendar, with a focus on the transition to year-round operations (YRO):

In summary, the proposed calendar significantly increases operational and instructional demands on the library without clear plans for additional resources, compensation, or structural adjustments. Stakeholders emphasize the need for careful implementation, added staffing and funding, and strategies to sustain service quality and staff well-being in a year-round model.

Key Points:

1. Operational Strain from Continuous Calendar

- The proposed calendar eliminates meaningful breaks between semesters (as little as one day), raising concerns about maintaining continuous, full-service library operations.
- Traditional reduced service periods (e.g., Thanksgiving week, intersessions) may no longer be feasible, increasing pressure on existing staffing models for library faculty, staff, and student employees.

2. Staffing and Budget Concerns

- Expanded year-round demand will require additional staffing by library faculty and staff as opposed to a redistribution of existing staffing resources.
- There is concern that spreading current student staffing budgets across three terms would dilute service quality; a phased or additive funding model is recommended.

3. Library Faculty Workload and Compensation Issues

- Library faculty anticipate increased instructional and service demand equivalent to adding a third semester (~33% more workload).
- Key questions include whether compensation, workload distribution, or expectations will be adjusted accordingly.

4. Sustainability of Services and Library Faculty and Staff Well-being

- Lack of downtime raises concerns about:
 - Scheduling vacations for library faculty and staff

- Updating instructional materials
- Preventing burnout
- There is uncertainty about how to maintain service quality across all terms without a “slow” period that is typically realized during the summer.

5. Need for Structural and Staffing Adjustments

- Suggested solutions include:
 - Hiring temporary or part-time faculty librarians
 - Creating faculty fellowship or short-term library faculty roles
 - Allowing rotational release time for faculty librarians
 - Gradual ramp-up of summer services rather than immediate parity with fall/spring

6. Broader Institutional Impacts

- The shift to YRO may require changes to library faculty governance, committee work, faculty development timelines, and conference participation.
- Additional planning is needed to align library operations with broader campus changes.

Feedback from Special Collections and Archives Staff:

- Inquiry about the availability of the 2027 and 2028 employee work schedules.
- March 31 is still listed as Cesar Chavez Day.

Solano Campus Academic Calendar Feedback Summary

Feedback from the Solano campus centers on minimizing operational conflicts, meeting regulatory requirements, and improving the student experience—particularly for licensed cadets and those transitioning between terms.

1. Spring Semester Start Timing

- The current start date (immediately after New Year's) creates a significant conflict with **Coast Guard (USCG) exam administration**, which traditionally occurs during the first week of January.
- When exams overlap with the first week of instruction, it effectively turns week one into a **high-stakes testing period**, disrupting instruction and campus operations.
- **Recommendation:** Delay the start of the Spring semester by approximately **5–7 days** so that the first day of instruction aligns with the second week of January (e.g., Jan 7–10 depending on the year). This would separate exams from instruction and reduce disruption.

2. USCG Licensing and Testing Requirements

- It is critical that **USCG exam week(s)** are clearly identified and protected in the academic calendar.
- Licensed cadets must have **two opportunities for initial testing**:
 - First: the **first full week after January 1**
 - Second: during **Spring Break**
- Academic scheduling must ensure compliance with **minimum sea-time and instructional requirements**, including:
 - At least **12 weeks of license-related sea-time courses**
 - Ideally, close to **15-week semesters** allows for absences while maintaining compliance

3. End-of-Term and Credentialing Constraints

- **Merchant Mariner Credentials (MMCs)** cannot be distributed at commencement if final grades are not posted in time.
- Misalignment between grading deadlines and commencement creates **administrative burdens** (e.g., shipping credentials or requiring later pickup).
- Calendar design should ensure **grades are finalized prior to commencement** if in-person distribution is expected.

4. Summer Term and Sea Training Alignment

- To meet minimum required sea-time (e.g., **90 days for deck cadets, 55 for engine cadets**), it is essential that:
 - **Summer sea terms and internships begin immediately after commencement**
 - There are **no gaps between academic terms**, or a formal “bridge” structure is created to preserve continuity and credit
- Efficient sequencing is especially important given the **compressed summer period** for cadets.

5. Housing, Dining, and Operational Transitions

- The transition from **Spring semester to Summer Sea Term** presents challenges for:
 - Housing turnover
 - Dining services continuity
- Calendar gaps or misalignment increase **logistical strain and costs**, including staffing and planning.

6. Cost and Staffing Implications

- Calendar structures that extend into **holidays or non-academic periods** increase the cost of maintaining **secured watch and campus operations**.
- Reducing unnecessary gaps or poorly aligned dates can help **minimize these expenses**.
- Longer, well-structured summer terms can positively impact **faculty morale** by allowing time for a **meaningful break with their families** after Summer Sea Training and before the Fall semester.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Shift the Spring start to avoid conflict with USCG exams
- Clearly define and protect exam periods
- Maintain compliance with sea-time and instructional requirements
- Ensure alignment between grading and commencement
- Keep terms tightly sequenced, especially into summer
- Account for operational impacts (housing, dining, security costs)
- Support faculty morale through more sustainable calendar design