CAL POLY
Academic Senate

**Academic Senate Meeting Minutes**
Tuesday, October 13, 2026 | 3:00 p.m. – 4:50 p.m.

## ATTENDEES

### ACADEMIC SENATORS PRESENT

**Abo-Ismail, Mohammed** (CAFES); **Alexander, Benjamin** (OCOB); **Anderson, Lisa** (OCOB); **Bennett, Darin** (CAFES); **Bracco, Angela** (CAED); **Bridger, Sarah** (CLA); **Clements, John** (CENG); **Derickson, Dennis** (CENG**); Ding, Shunping** (CAFES); **Easton, Robert** (BCSM); **Fairbanks, Matthew** (BCSM); **Frame, Samuel (Academic Senate Chair); Fraser, Scott** (BCSM); **Garner, Lauren** (CAFES); **Gray, Christine** (PCS); **Greenwood, Jerusha** (Immediate Past Senate Chair); **Haft, Jennifer** (Office of the President, ex officio, non-voting); **Hardy, Kristin** (BCSM); **Healy, Brian** (CLA); **Hitchcock, Kara** (PCS); **Hurley, Sean** (Academic Senate Vice Chair); **Inoue, Taiyo** (ASCSU Senator); **Jankovitz, Kris** (BCSM); **Jones, Seamus** (CENG); **Kolegraff, Stacy** (CAED); **Lester, Sarah** (PCS); **Liddicoat, Al** (Provost, ex officio, non-voting); **Lin, Patrick** (CLA); **Lund, Ulric** (BCSM); **Maerz, Addison** (OCOB); **Malama, Bwalya** (CAFES); **Mealy, James** (CENG); **Miller, Ryan** (CAED); **Minor, Elizabeth** (CLA); **Myers, Allison** (CLA); **Navarro, José** (ASCSU Senator); **Nelson, Leslie** (CLA); **Oppenheim, Tomas** (CENG); **Pan, John** (CENG); **Pearse, Erin** (BCSM); **Perez, Carrie** (PCS); **Perry, Nathan** (CLA - *proxy, Sarah Bridger*); **Peuker, Steffen** (CENG); **Pollin, Andy** (CAED); **Poshtan, Majid** (CENG); **Potterton, Kristin** (CAED); **Rein, Steve** (ASCSU Senator); **Ruttenberg, Ben** (BCSM); **Scaramozzino, Jeanine** (PCS); **Schinderle, Tanner** (ASI president, ex officio, non-voting); **Short, Olivia** (Chair of ASI Board of Directors, ex officio, non-voting); **Stegner, Dustin** (ASCSU Senator); **Trada, Hiren** (CENG); **Vokos, Stamatis** (BCSM); **Wang, Cindy** (OCOB); **Wendt, Dean** (Dean's Council, ex officio, non-voting); **Wolfe-Chandler, Christina** (PCS); **Wright, Ava** (CLA); **Wu, Julia** (CENG); **Yang, Hocheol** (CLA); **Yeh, Grace** (CLA)

### ACADEMIC SENATORS ABSENT

**Cole, Matthew** (OCOB); **Kommer, Thomas** (CAED); **Richards, Rebecca** (PCS)

### GUESTS

Aloisio, Simone; Bailey, Helen; Bettergarcia, Julie; Canady, Sabrina; Darin, Jessica; De Lay, Ann; Dhillon, Anuraj; Fernflores, Rachel; Fernsler, Jonathan; Gutierrez, Gianna; Gutierrez, Thomas; Janke, Dawn; Janssen, Amber; Kekaha, Michelle; Klay, Jennifer; Kolodziejski, Lauren; Kumar, Maneesh; Lathrop, Amanda; Lin, Joyce; Macdonald, Sarah; Josh Machamer; May, Cheryl; Makekau, Beya; Marsalek, Kim; Merrit Miller, Beth; Morris, Andrew; O'Clair, Katherine; Palazzo, Anthony; Parsons, Daniel; Pedersen, Mary; Pinisetty, Dinesh; Rinaldi, Charlotte; Sebastian, Kelly; Sullivan-Danser, Shannon; Sunata, Cem; Swackhamer, Marc; Teramoto Pedrotti, Jennifer; Vanderkar, Cari; Walters, Tad; Windokun, Prema; Zelezny, Lynnette

## MINUTES

1. **Call to Order |** Samuel Frame, Academic Senate Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes |** The Academic Senate Meeting minutes from September 8, 2026, meeting were approved.

3. **Communications and Announcements |** Samuel Frame, Academic Senate Chair, shared that there are two important vacancies needing faculty representation. The first is the Academic Senate Sustainability Committee, and the second is the University Union Advisory Board, which he is unable to attend due to scheduling conflicts. A list of vacancies and statement of interest forms can be found here for Academic Senate committees and here for university committees.

4. **Consent Agenda |** All items on the consent agenda were approved without objection.

5. **Reports**

**5.1. Academic Senate Chair |** Samuel Frame, Academic Senate Chair, had no report.

**5.2. Office of the President |** The Office of the President provided a written report, which can be found on the agenda on pages 10-11. Additionally, Jennifer Haft, Chief of Staff, shared that the YRO website has not been published yet; they will send an email once it is available. She also shard that the APC union reached a tentative agreement in their contract negotiation. More information can be found on the CSU's website.

**5.3. Office of the Provost |** Al Liddicoat, Provost and Executive Vice President, provided a written report, which can be found on the agenda on page 12. Additionally, Provost Liddicoat shared that he is meeting with colleges and departments about YRO to identify areas of concern and ways to improve communications.

**5.4. CSU Statewide Senate |** Steve Rein, SLO Statewide Senator, reported that Governor Newsom signed AB 2694 and SB 960 but vetoed AB 2301, which had to do with community college bachelor's degrees. He encouraged Senators to read the Governor's veto statement, which can be found here. José Navarro, SLO Statewide Senator, reported on the interim plenary meeting and standing committee meetings. One topic during the interim plenary Committee of the Whole was how credit for prior learning, or credit for prior service, will be interpreted for students who attended community colleges. Additionally, the JEDI Committee talked about advancing two resolutions on (1) transparency in the CSU ANAPI initiative and (2) data related to multiracial faculty, staff, and students. The JEDI Committee is also discussing recommending term limits for ASCSU senators in an effort to promote diversity and inclusion. Taiyo Inoue, Solano Statewide Senator, reported on the APEP Committee's discussion of the UC system's review of high school student readiness and what that might mean for SAT and A-G requirements. The UC's report is expected in May 2027. The APEP Committee is also discussing 90-unit Bachelor of Education degrees and what that might mean in terms of disciplinary-specific readiness with the reduced-unit degree. Lastly, he mentioned the Teach for California outreach campaign, backed by $250 million, in educator-residency funding. Dustin Stegner, SLO Statewide Senator, reported that the Academic Affairs Committee is discussing applications for applied doctoral programs, which are being proposed by approximately 8-10 CSU campuses. He will try to provide a list of those programs. Lastly, the Academic Affairs Committee as well as the entire ASCSU passed a resolution asking the Chancellor's Office and Board of Trustees to reconsider three-year bachelor's degrees. Since that has already been approved, they are moving forward.

**5.5. CFA |** Lisa Kawamura, CFA San Luis Obispo President, provided a written report, which can be found on the agenda on pages 13-19. Tad Walters, who attended on behalf of CFA, also shared

that they are in the fact-finding stage as part of the statutory process of negotiations. He also reported that CFA-SLO spoke with parents and students at Mustang Family Weekend regarding YRO and received many comments on workplace safety concerns, particularly as it relates to recent heat waves.

**5.6. ASI |** Tanner Schinderle, ASI President, and Olivia Short, ASI Board of Directors Chair, provided a written report, which can be found on the agenda on page 20. ASI President Schinderle also reported that they will providing a new service that offers subsidized Uber rides for students to the airport and train station before and after Thanksgiving and fall and spring breaks. Students will receive an email about the vouchers. He also encourage faculty to invite students to complete their voter registration. ASI Chair Short also reported that the next Board of Directors' meeting will be on October 14 at 5 p.m. One of the agenda items will be an update to the ASI election code.

**5.7. Strategic Enrollment Management & Student Success |** The Division of Strategic Enrollment Management & Student Success provided a written report, which can be found on the agenda on pages 21-24.

**6. Discussion Items |** None

**7. Special Reports**

**7.1. Results of the Opinion and Feedback about Year-Round Operations Survey and Questions |** Ben Ruttenberg, BCSM Senator, provided a presentation about the results of faculty, staff, and student perceptions and questions related to Year-Round Operations. The slides may be viewed here.

**7.2. Caucus Reports on YRO |** The seven caucus chairs provided reports on their constituencies' concerns and feedback on YRO. Those reports have been attached to these meeting minutes.

**8. Business Items**

**8.1. Resolution on Modification of the Academic Senate Bylaws regarding the Instruction Committee (Academic Policies Committee) |** Kris Jankovitz, Academic Senate Instruction Committee Chair, introduced in first reading a resolution to change the responsibilities and name of the committee to better reflect the work that the committee does. This resolution will return in first reading at an upcoming meeting.

**9. Adjournment**: Samuel Frame, Academic Senate Chair, adjourned the meeting at 4:49 pm.

*Minutes submitted by Shannon Sullivan-Danser, Academic Senate Analyst*

BCSM SPECIAL REPORT

**Summary of Feedback about proposed YRO Calendars for 27-28, 28-29, 29-30**

Three things are consistent:

- In terms of feasibility the 14+1calendar is the most reasonable option for YRO operations. Equal-length terms and retained breaks are viewed as improvements, but they do not resolve short between term transitions, weekend workday concerns, or the strain of a continuous instructional cycle.

- While much of the feedback acknowledged the feasibility of the 14+1 calendar for YRO, it should not be inferred that the faculty, staff and students in BCSM are in favor of moving to YRO operation for the 2027-28 academic year. In general, currently there is little to no support for adopting a YRO model.

- BCSM faculty report frustration and disappointment at the lack of transparency and detailed justification to accelerate the timeline ahead of the previously communicated assurance of later transition. President Armstrong communicated to the faculty that Cal Poly would remain on a 15+1 Fall, Spring AY with a compressed summer schedule for the first two years of semesters.

**Specific Concerns among BCSM faculty, staff and students:**

**YRO raises unresolved equity and student-experience questions:** There is significant concern that students on different enrollment tracks will not receive equivalent educational and co-curricular opportunities. How will students be assigned to Fall–Spring versus Summer–Fall cohorts; concerned that the summer pathway would become a less-resourced, second-tier experience;

how would first-year housing would work; and how could students on an off-cycle calendar participate in research, internships, employment, and opportunities at institutions using traditional calendars.

**Risks to the quality of the curriculum.** Departments need time to determine what content can be compressed or relocated and how prerequisites, labs, finals, accreditation expectations, and learning outcomes will be protected. Departments need time to work with programs outside the college that we serve to assure that program learning outcomes for those programs are met. The multiple calendar changes compromises to some of the programs in the school of education and risks the collaborative relationship with local public school that support our teacher education programs.

**Questions as to the Readiness for YRO implementation.** Much of the feedback includes questions as to whether adequate planning has occurred for staffing, technical support, facilities, summer heat/air conditioning, advising, housing, and departmental operations.

**Facilities are a readiness requirement.** YRO operations impact on facilities, equipment and support for research activities has potential consequences to faculty research programs and BCSM's established Summer Undergraduate Research Programs. Laboratory operations require protected time for equipment maintenance, course development, repairs, and as faculty research space. Continuous high-demand lab instruction could erode those functions unless additional staffing, space, and resources are provided before the transition to YRO.

**Compromise to academic processes:** A short break interval between spring/summer and summer/fall terms creates practical

problems for grading, prerequisite clearance, advising, student transitions, and APDQ/Appeals.

**Faculty/Staff/Student inequities and burnout:** Year-round instruction would significantly affect support staff and their working conditions. The university needs a credible plan for lecturer employment, tenure-track faculty workload, support staff and technician coverage, faculty scheduling, office space, evaluation & RPT processes, service loads**,** curriculum-development compensation, and plan to guard the risk of creating a two-tier teaching and staffing system.

# Key Takeaways from the BCSM Feedback:

**Calendar compression has academic consequences.** Departments need time to determine what content can be compressed or relocated and how prerequisites, labs, finals, accreditation expectations, and learning outcomes will be protected.

**Readiness for 2027-28 has not been demonstrated.** Feedback repeatedly favors maintaining the 15-week structure while completing curricular review, program coordination, and operational planning for YRO.

**Better guarantee that student pathways will be demonstrably equivalent.** The proposed model needs clear safeguards, so summer-track students have comparable access to instruction, research, internships, clinical practice, advising, housing, support, and community participation.

**Lack of explicit protections for workload and compensation.** Fair faculty load**,** lecturer assignment and contract clarity, compensation for service during off terms, and guidance for evaluation & RPT, committee work, and faculty development opportunities. Faculty and Support Staff require workable breaks.

**There is no credible plan for adequate teaching, research and office space. Facilities are a readiness requirement.** Year-round instruction requires a credible plan for climate control, classroom and lab maintenance, equipment repairs, technical support, space, and protected downtime for preparation and preventive maintenance.

**How will shared governance function year-round.** Departments need a model for meetings, committees, reviews, and timely decision-making when faculty cohorts are on different work cycles. Respondents also seek meaningful student and partner input before decisions are finalized.

**Calendar symmetry must maintain meaningful breaks between term.** Calendar transitions must allow enough time for grading, course and space preparation, advising, staffing tasks, leave, and recovery.

# Several Areas of Consensus

1. **Maintain the 15+1-week Fall/Spring structure**. This will provide time for curriculum modification during the 2028-29 catalog cycle providing adequate time to prepare for a 14+1 term.
2. **Use transparent shared governance.** The University should explain assumptions, tradeoffs, authority, financial and enrollment logic, risks, and contingency plans, then respond substantively to feedback.
3. **Do not bypass curricular review.** Departments need normal review pathways, coordination with client majors and external partners, sufficient lead time, and support for the workload of redesign.
4. **Protect quality and equity across student pathways.** Comparable educational access and outcomes should be defined and assessed before students are placed in different calendar cohorts.
5. **Any YRO plan must guarantee protections for faculty/staff workload and compensation.** Predictable and fair tenure-track and Lecturer workloads, compensation plan for service off-term.
6. **Demonstrate capacity to fund the operating model.** Staffing, facilities, climate control, classrooms, laboratories, maintenance, advising, housing, and support services cannot be treated as downstream details.
7. **Address program-specific constraints directly.** Accreditation, clinical practice, service courses, laboratory operations, graduate programs, research, and external schedules require direct, program-level planning.

Academic Senate Meeting: October 13

CAED Caucus Chair Report

The College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) has significant concerns about Year-Round Operations (YRO) and the proposed academic calendars. CAED does not reject year-round operations outright, but implementation must address workload, instructional quality, facilities, and equity before moving forward.

- This report draws on consolidated departmental feedback, consultation memos, and proposed calendar models.
- CAED's studio- and laboratory-based programs require scheduling flexibility and adequate time for facility maintenance.
- Implementation must include sufficient resources, meaningful consultation, and opportunities to assess and revise the approach.

2. Workload, Staffing, and Capacity

CAED faculty and staff are already experiencing widespread burnout following a short summer turnaround, semester conversion, and campus initiatives. Previous campus initiatives increased workloads before the necessary resources were available, raising concerns that YRO will follow the same pattern.

- Only two of CAED's five departments are proceeding with YRO, but scheduling and operational decisions will also affect non-participating departments.
- Departmental feedback raises concerns about eliminating spring break, shortening winter breaks, and relying heavily on weekend faculty workdays to meet CSU minimum workday requirements.
- Three equal terms could create scheduling conflicts, strain staff capacity, and reduce time for faculty research and scholarship.
- How will resources be provided before implementation, and how will the university determine whether implementation plans are falling short?

3. Instructional Quality and Calendar Flexibility

CAED reports no broad consensus in support of a standardized, symmetrical three-term calendar. The college strongly favors 15+0 flexibility, which retains the fifteenth week for instruction, studio work, or final project reviews rather than a separate final examination week.

- Consolidated feedback identifies a unified department-head preference for a 15+0 / 15+0 / 15+0 model, with a 15+1 / 15+1 / 12 model identified as a transition option.
- An alternative 15+1 / 15+1 / 7.5 model would offer an intensive summer session rather than three identical terms, drawing on the precedent of shorter quarter-system summer sessions.
- Moving to 14+1 immediately after semester conversion would require another substantial round of course and schedule redesign.
- Feedback warns that 14+1 could compromise instructional quality without flexibility to use the final week for instruction and project-based learning.
- Faculty need clear answers about instructional minutes, possible changes to 50-minute class periods, and whether formal course proposal revisions would be required.

4. Facilities, Shop Maintenance, and Operational Limits

CAED's facilities, fabrication shops, and technical laboratories are already operating at maximum capacity. Continuous instruction would reduce the time available to maintain safe, functional spaces between student cohorts.

- The traditional summer maintenance window supports machinery servicing, safety overhauls, equipment upgrades, laboratory cleaning, and fabrication-space reconfiguration.
- Increased year-round use would add wear to shops and equipment while reducing opportunities for repairs.
- Calendar changes could also disrupt orientation, town halls, awards ceremonies, and other recurring college activities.

5. Equity, Governance, Accreditation, and System Alignment

YRO must provide equitable conditions for students, faculty, and staff, whether or not their departments participate. Calendar decisions also require careful review of professional accreditation, financial aid, and alignment with the broader CSU system.

- Faculty governance participation and ARPT processes and timelines must remain equitable across participating and non-participating departments.
- Students on year-round schedules must retain equitable access to advising, campus services, and co-curricular opportunities.
- Feedback requests formal reviews of potential accreditation and financial aid risks associated with compressed or non-traditional terms.

- Proposed calendars diverge from the broader CSU calendar, raising questions about a key justification previously offered for semester conversion.

6. Requests and Considerations Before Implementation

CAED requests a transparent, adequately resourced implementation process that protects instructional quality and allows concerns to be addressed before rollout. The YRO SharePoint site is a welcome step toward improving access to information, but it must be paired with concrete plans and meaningful consultation.

- Provide a workload, staffing, advising, and compensation plan before implementation.
- Complete an equity analysis covering academic services, co-curricular opportunities, faculty governance, and ARPT processes.
- Allow meaningful calendar flexibility, including 15+0, for programs with studio, laboratory, and accreditation requirements.
- Establish checkpoints for consultation, assessment, and decisions to pause or revise implementation.

CAFES Caucus Report on YRO Concerns

Presented to the Academic Senate on Oct. 13, 2026 by CAFES Caucus Chair, Lauren Garner

**Faculty and Staff Impacts**

**1.** YRO could substantially undermine Cal Poly's culture, sense of community, collegiality, shared governance, and faculty/staff collaboration within individual departments, our college, and the university at large. If faculty members work in different academic terms, opportunities for regular department meetings, committee meetings, curriculum coordination and development, mentoring, a fair & equitable RPT process, collaborative scholarship, shared governance and professional interaction will be substantially reduced or impaired. This could directly impact faculty and staff recruitment and retention.

**2.** For many departments in CAFES YRO would negatively impact the TSM, as a substantial amount of scholarship, including field research, laboratory research, student mentoring, proposal development, and staff prep work and support must take place during the summer. Also, by switching to YRO, Cal Poly would be out-of-synch internally and with other universities, industry, and agencies, thereby limiting opportunities for cross-disciplinary research or multi-institutional research.

**3.** The University must clearly define which faculty would be required to teach during summer, how assignments would be determined, whether participation would be voluntary or mandatory, and how workload and compensation would be handled.

**4.** Requiring 3 equal length semesters, necessitates a 14+1 calendar to allow for even modest breaks during and between terms and the calendars out of sync with all other institutions.

Cal Poly's courses are all designed and approved on a 15+1 calendar, so clarification is needed regarding which courses will require revision and resubmission for a 14+1 calendar, who will perform this work, what support will be provided, and how departments will manage the resulting workload before the 14+1 calendar is implemented. If new course proposals are not required, clarification is required as to how courses are to be effectively implemented without inappropriate variation in or loss of course content from instructor to instructor and/or in a sequenced or prerequisite course.

The YRO calendars include but do not define three weekend faculty workdays per term but need to specify what constitutes a faculty workday, what duties would be expected, and how conflicts with family obligations and religious observance would be addressed.

**Student Impacts**

**1.** As with faculty and staff, breaking up cohorts with different semester patterns could substantially undermine student culture, sense of community, and collaboration within individual departments, our college, and the university at large, ultimately impacting student recruitment, retention, and future alumni involvement.

**2.** The proposed calendar puts Cal Poly out of sync with the rest of the CSU and most other universities, challenging student ability to participate in CSU online, study abroad experiences, and other undergraduate experiences that rely on calendars which are more or less equivalent

across multiple institutions. Most internships in CAFES occur during the summer as this time frame coincides with seasonal activities and employer expectations. Requiring students to enroll in summer terms would therefore create direct conflicts with these opportunities. Overall YRO could limit access to many of these opportunities, which are key to their educational and professional development.

**3.** Students need to be clearly informed of the instructional and financial implications of the proposed 14+1 calendar. The one-week reduction is a 6.7% reduction in scheduled instructional time per term resulting in a loss of educational content and quality. Based on CAFES' tuition and fees for new students, a 28-week instructional year equates to approximately $561 per instructional week, as opposed to approximately $524 per instructional week under the current calendar.

**4. Tracks**

It remains unclear whether students will choose or be assigned a track (fall/spring, spring/summer, or summer/fall), and when/if/how they can change tracks (to change majors, participate in a high impact practice, graduate more quickly, etc.).

It remains unclear which students would be required to attend one or more summer terms and how those students would be selected, and how the University would ensure equitable access to required courses, housing, financial aid, employment, internships, and other student support services during summer terms.

There are no high schools or community colleges in CA (or, to our knowledge, the United States) that graduate in March or April; therefore, it is unclear which students would enroll in the summer/fall track, or if 1st year students could only begin in the Fall or Spring.

**For all**

The financial costs and benefits of YRO have not been articulated, or formally, independently, reviewed, analyzed, and/or audited. Though some universities described as peer institutions have been considered as models, it is important to note that other universities have considered or tried YRO without sustained success to implement YRO models; have those universities also been studied. If YRO is implemented at Cal Poly, how will its success and sustainability be assessed and what plans will be implemented if it is deemed unsuccessful. . especially with respect to the beginning enrollment cliff  risks

**Conclusion**

CAFES faculty are concerned that the proposed year-round operations model would diminish the quality of both a Cal Poly education and employment at Cal Poly. Because the University has not adequately addressed the concerns identified above nor sufficiently demonstrated how YRO would benefit students, we call upon Cal Poly to pause further implementation of the proposed 14+1 year-round calendar and YRO planning until these questions have been answered in writing, shared transparently with faculty and students, and subjected to meaningful consultation through established shared governance processes.

I collected feedback from CENG department chairs, the college's earlier academic-calendar consultation, an earlier CENG faculty survey, and targeted surveys in EE and ME.

I want to begin with one point of balance: **CENG does not have a single unanimous position.** IME reports no major concerns with YRO, and some faculty there are supportive. At the same time, the feedback from several other departments raises significant unresolved concerns. I will focus on those that are especially important for engineering.

**First is academic quality and the academic calendar.** Engineering curricula are highly sequential and contain substantial laboratory, project, and design work. If we move from 15 to 14 instructional weeks without increasing weekly meeting time, scheduled instructional contact falls by 6.67 percent. In one 129-unit Mechanical Engineering curriculum analysis, that corresponds to about **148 clock hours of direct contact over the degree, including about 60 hours of laboratory instruction**. This does not mean credits disappear from the transcript; it means the scheduled contact underlying the curriculum is reduced.

So the question is: **what content, labs, design experiences, or supervision will be removed—or will weekly meeting times increase enough to preserve that contact?**

The two calendar options create different problems. Fourteen-plus-one preserves more time between terms but reduces instructional time. Fifteen-plus-one preserves instructional weeks but leaves extremely short turnaround between terms. CENG's calendar feedback explicitly cautioned that a preference for 14+1 over 15+1 should **not** be interpreted as endorsement of 14+1. A 15+0 option has generated some interest, but there is not college-wide agreement on eliminating a separate finals week.

**Second, the three-track model creates major curriculum and student-access questions.** In EE the top concern was inequity created by the three-track system, followed closely by disruption of course sequencing and reduced technical-elective availability. AERO also identified senior design and multi-term course sequences as a top concern.

These are not abstract scheduling issues. Engineering programs have long prerequisite chains, specialized electives, labs, and capstone sequences. Faculty expertise is also not interchangeable across subdisciplines. Before a program is placed into YRO, **we need to see a program-level model showing that students on every track can complete prerequisites, required labs, senior design, and a meaningful set of technical electives without delaying graduation.**

**Third, year-round instruction requires year-round laboratory and staffing capacity.** Engineering labs need preventive maintenance, calibration, repair, upgrades, reconfiguration, restocking, and setup. Much of that work cannot happen while a lab is continuously in use. Staff and technical specialists are also not interchangeable. The

college's calendar feedback repeatedly asked when this work will occur if the gaps between terms are compressed.

A credible YRO plan therefore needs the **staffing, technical support, space, and maintenance plan before implementation—not after problems appear.**

**Fourth is faculty workload and departmental governance.** In the ME survey, 14 of 22 respondents selected faculty workload and teaching-track arrangements among their top three concerns—the highest-ranked issue. Department operations, shared governance and RPT, staffing, and research access during off terms were also prominent.

In an earlier voluntary CENG survey with 69 respondents, **52 were moderately or very concerned about the YRO transition, and 55 were moderately or very concerned about effects on faculty workload and work schedules.**

Departments still have to conduct hiring, RPT, curriculum work, committee service, advising, scheduling, and leadership even when faculty are distributed across different teaching tracks. We need a workable governance model, not an assumption that departments will somehow absorb that complexity. These same issues—shared governance, RPT, laboratory access, research, and faculty workload across different terms—have also emerged in departmental planning.

**Finally, several respondents questioned the pace of implementation so soon after the semester transition.** The administration's own YRO materials say implementation will be **phased and data-driven**.

CENG therefore needs to see the data and the decision criteria: **student demand by track, enrollment assumptions, effects on time to degree, staffing and hiring requirements, instructional-contact and accreditation implications, and the resources needed to maintain equivalent laboratory and student experiences across all three terms.**

The recurring message I heard is not simply, *"do not change."* It is: **do not lock in implementation before the academic model, resources, and governance structures have been demonstrated to work.**

Where those questions remain unresolved, the implementation timeline should slow enough for meaningful faculty review and for the university to address them before program commitments are made.

Thank you.

CLA Caucus Report on YRO
October 13, 2026

The CLA caucus strongly opposes the currently proposed 14+1 and 15+1 calendars for Year-Round Operations. Members of our caucus have mixed views about YRO in principle. All members, however, share a range of unanswered questions and concerns about feasibility, implementation, and actual benefits. Feedback from across the CLA indicates that faculty and staff in general have also raised similar questions, with clear concerns about the implications of YRO and the YRO-aligned calendars for teaching, workload, quality of life, student experience, recruitment, etc.

- Calendar Misalignment
    - A major reason for moving to semesters was to better align Cal Poly's calendar with other CSUs and community colleges to improve transfer access and also improve student access to High-Impact Practices.
    - The YRO calendar disrupts this, particularly for students taking Spring/Summer terms, as many Spring study abroad programs, internships and other opportunities extend well into May.
    - This will particularly affect CLA students, as many departments require study abroad, internships, or other field work as part of the curriculum.
- Operational Feasibility
    - There is a gross lack of clarity about operational feasibility across all areas of the university. The following are a few points relevant to CLA.
    - Periods between terms are too short in both the 14+1 and 15+1 calendars.
        - There is not enough time allocated for class preparation between terms, especially since faculty course loads have increased under the semester conversion.
        - On the advising and staff side, there is also not enough time for end-of-term administrative processing for pre-reqs, academic notice, financial aid, etc. <u>This may lead to students being dropped from classes, financial aid, or even housing after they've already begun attending classes in the next term.</u>
    - Many departments in CLA like Music and Theater need students to be present together and consistently. It's impossible to run a jazz band or theatrical production, for example, when students are scattered across different terms.
        - A significant number of students who participate in these activities come from across the university, making this an issue regardless of whether these departments themselves switch to YRO.
    - There are also serious concerns amongst faculty about how departmental decision making and service will function if faculty are dispersed across terms.
- Facilities
    - Many departments in the CLA rely on studio and lab spaces that need regular maintenance and updating. Moving to YRO will make it impossible to maintain and operate these spaces if they are continuously occupied.

    - This is also true of general facilities maintenance beyond studio and lab spaces.
    - It will be necessary to hire a significant number of additional studio and lab techs in order to properly staff studios and lab spaces year round, since many of them require a staff member to be there if students are using the spaces for safety reasons.
- Campus Culture
    - Operating across different terms will fracture campus culture for both faculty and students.
        - Many CLA programs have a dedicated Foundations curriculum that students take in their first year. Beyond course content, foundations programs build social cohesion within a student cohort, which is necessary for student well-being and academic success. YRO will fracture Foundations programs and make it significantly more difficult to build cohesion within student cohorts.
        - It will similarly harm social cohesion amongst faculty within a department.
    - There is widespread concern about faculty and student burnout, as there aren't sufficient breaks between terms.
- General Education and YRO
    - Because of CLA's significant role in supporting General Education requirements on campus, our departments and curricula will be impacted by YRO even if our programs themselves do not transition.
    - GE courses are meant to expose students to new perspectives and support the development of secondary interests. Students in summer will have a more limited range of GE course options, which will negatively affect the quality of their degree.
- Inequalities
    - Lecturers and new tenure-track faculty will be disproportionately affected by requirements to teach in the Summer. This will exacerbate existing inequalities between lecturers and tenure-track faculty. It will also cause new inequalities amongst tenure-track faculty.
    - These inequalities will make it harder to recruit new faculty.
    - Faculty with children who are forced to teach in summer will be especially impacted, given the misalignment with K-12 calendars.
- Actual Benefits?
    - We wonder how YRO will be economically beneficial, given:
        - The number of new faculty and staff that will need to be hired
        - The increase in university operational costs in general
        - The negative impacts the above listed issues may have on student enrollment.

Academic Senate Meeting Transcript – October 13, 2026

**OCOB remarks on YRO**

**Benjamin Alexander:** I'm going to edit on the fly a little bit, because a lot has already been said. There's not one single view about YRO at OCOB, though majority are suspicious to opposed, and universally, I think there's concern about aspects of YRO implementation, widespread confusion. Really gonna try and edit as I go through, and affirm… There's broad concern about lack of clarity around the planning, about coordination of classes, and student access to courses at the time that they need them for degree progress, concern about student access to internships and other experiences, as other people have expressed, concern about – not sure that this has come up – concern about housing availability for students living off-campus, given current lease cycles, concern about space preparedness, a desire for more clarity around the modeling of demand – modeling of student degree progress – impacts on student degree progress, on staffing and much more. Clarity around admission standards, pointing out that maintaining Cal Poly-qualified doesn't mean that the line for admission is the same. If we're admitting more students, will they also be admitted to the same degree program, or will it be a self-support mirror? Will this determination be based on self-selection by the applicants at the time of the application? Will it be a choice that they're given after being admitted? Are they able to switch later?

Yes, as others have expressed, clarity around personnel processes on implications for recruitment retention for sabbaticals, coordinating sabbaticals when we already had tension around the capacity to provide classes when they need to be offered for students to progress smoothly. How will we determine when people will work? Will they be fixed to the same terms year after year? Who's going to work during summer? Will this primarily impact new hires, lecturers?

Our solution: be equitable. Recognizing that, as we do, I think, increasingly pay attention to the impacts of YRO on the student experience, we also need to be considering not just our personnel processes and the way that staff and faculty engage in service, but employee engagement and impacts for employee engagement.

OCOB has a preference for the 14 plus 1 calendar, but I would raise the question, why are we seeking to make this change for next year, as opposed to waiting for 2028-29? Finally…not finally. If the three-track model has been selected as the operational model for YRO, which is broadly how we've been discussing it, why? There are other models for year-round operations, students attending year-round with work-integrated learning, internships or co-ops, research, study abroad, things like that, as they are enrolled throughout the year, is another model for year-round operations, and it isn't clear yet why we are pursuing the model that we are pursuing.

Where is generative AI in the year-round operation planning? We talk about it a lot in lots of spaces on campus as we continue to expend resources on YRO – time, mental strain – we aren't really directing our attention to what's probably the most disruptive force facing higher education at the same time as we plan another dramatic transition for our university. Generative AI is inevitably going to change a lot of what we do and change it likely before we even get to 2028-29. How and what students learn, how they look for advising, what employers expect our graduates to be able to do, how we admit, when and through what modalities we deliver, for our students, and for our employer partners, for California. The demographic cliff, labor market, that could look very different in two years, even as we design a calendar, staffing levels, advising ratios, and everything we are, is based on what we are as a university today.

We're going to lock things in. We risk locking things in for the university we are today, as we plan for YRO, building for something that we are already changing away from.

So, at the very least, as we continue to talk about YRO and plan for YRO, I hope that we'll explicitly make part of that discussion how AI changes our operations and what we offer the students.

Caucus Report on YRO- Professional Consultative Services (PCS)

Kara Hitchcock, PCS Caucus Chair

Thank you to our Senate chair for this time to speak. I have the honor and complicated job of representing feedback from PCS which is a large and very diverse caucus.

When I asked each unit for their feedback on the calendar, it became apparent that it is nearly impossible to talk about the calendar without also exploring the implications of YRO on workload and staffing. Our roles are intimately tied with the logistics, with the rhythms of the calendar and the flow of each term. It has been incredibly challenging for us to assess whether this calendar will work if we don't understand how YRO will work. We have provided our lists of concerns to leadership for a few years now, but those concerns have not been addressed. I would ask that each area be consulted in a way that respects the expertise and value that we bring to Cal Poly and that our concerns are addressed directly and responsibly.

Regarding the calendar, a few key themes arose.

First, we echo concerns about how CP will fall out of alignment with many other CSUs and broader higher ed systems, which was the reason given for the semester conversion. Is this not a priority or concern anymore? Also, what are the implications of managing BPP programs on significantly different calendars as they also increase in scale?

Second, the breaks between terms, even on the 14+1, are incredibly short. Most of us struggled to envision a way for this calendar to work based on the current systems and processes that have been mentioned already today (Academic Notice and Subject to Dismissal, Financial Aid/SAP, PERC, degree processing, etc.). Without information about how this will work logistically, it is challenging to explore opportunities to do anything different, especially as our systems are tied to complex workflows, software limitations, system updates, as well as curriculum changes and faculty programming.

Furthermore, it has been mentioned by some folks that this shouldn't really affect those of us on 12-month contracts because we're already here, but this statement misses the issue entirely. We are here all year, and we almost unanimously rely heavily on breaks between terms as well as summer to assess, plan, prepare, ideate, collaborate (across divisions and units) and implement the work that we do, that is essential to our roles. We have felt, and continue to feel, the impact of an intensified summer with increased workload already this summer with the semester conversion.

We know that YRO will bring an increase in work to each of our areas in that we will have to duplicate many efforts significantly (like orientation programming and training student assistants) while also increasing the standard work that we're already doing due to enrollment increases by anywhere from 30-55%. Given that we are 12-month employees, that means that if adjustments are delayed, we will be expected to work at 133-150% capacity without an immediate proportional reduction to our other duties, additional hires, or increases in pay.

For library faculty specifically, this could impact their ability to do research and present a significant barrier to earning tenure through no fault of our own.

This leads to the other unifying question across all areas represented – what is the plan to assess need and hire more PCS employees, allocate more resources (including funding), AND fairly compensate employees who provide highly-utilized and specialized student-facing services? The SharePoint language is vague and does not instill confidence or trust for PCS members.

It takes time to hire, to onboard and train people. It takes even more time for folks to develop confidence and competence in what they've been hired to do. The time to hire and recruit folks is not at the start of YRO but prior.

We have already felt student needs increasing, as much as 70% within the last year in some areas. If we are not equipped to meet those needs, then the people most impacted will not only be our students but also our faculty, as their workload will increase and their support will decrease.

Think about what areas are impacted when we don't have enough HR staff, Registrar staff, Academic Advisors, Librarians, DRC Access Specialists and Testing Coordinators, CARE Coordinators and Dean of Students support, SAFER Advocates, Basic Needs and Health/Wellbeing professionals, Financial Aid Counselors, Writing and Learning staff, International Center staff, Housing support, Career Counselors, facilities workers, ASCs, and more. How many areas of campus will be impacted, and what is the collective burden that will be felt if we don't have enough people and if we don't have the institutional knowledge needed to be ready to support YRO?

How can we build communities of care around our students if we have neither the community availability nor the capacity to care adequately about our students in the way they deserve?

We recognize that our roles are essential to how this campus functions as an organization, as demonstrated during COVID and Q2S. When students struggle, we are the lifeline that

listens and advocates and helps them find connection across campus. In our own unique ways, we keep things running and make amazing things possible for students, staff, and faculty alike. In a time of great change, it is important that PCS and other staff needs are prioritized and that our concerns and questions about implementation are responded to sooner rather than later so that we can find ways to continue doing the work that needs to be done. Thank you for listening.