I. **Minutes:** Approval of January 23, 2018 minutes (pp. 3-4)

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

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

IV. **Special Reports:**
A. [TIME CERTAIN 3:45 P.M.] Update on Budgeting Outlook by Cindy Villa, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance and Victor Brancart, Associate Vice President for Administration and Finance.

B. [TIME CERTAIN 4 P.M.] Update on Cal Poly’s GE Program by Brenda Helmbrecht, Chair of the Academic Senate GE Governance Board, Andrew Morris and Gregg Fiegel, Co-Chairs of the GE Task Force (p. 5).

V. **Consent Agenda:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name or Course Number, Title</th>
<th>ASCC recommendation/ Other</th>
<th>Academic Senate</th>
<th>Provost</th>
<th>Term Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Leadership minor New Course Proposals: AG 254 Introduction to Agricultural Leadership (2), 2 lectures – reviewed 5/4/17; additional information requested from department. Recommended for approval 11/16/17. AG 410 Advanced Agricultural Leadership Experience (1), 1 activity – reviewed 5/4/17; additional information requested from department. Recommended for approval 11/16/17. AG 412 Advanced Leadership Practice – Poly Royal Rodeo (3), 1 lecture, 2 activities –</td>
<td>Courses and program reviewed 5/4/17; additional information requested from the department. Courses and program reviewed 11/16/17; courses were recommended for approval; additional information on program requested from the department. Program recommended for approval 1/11/18.</td>
<td>On the 2/6/18 consent agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG 413</td>
<td>Committee Management – Poly Royal Rodeo</td>
<td>5/4/17</td>
<td>Requested from department. Recommended for approval 11/16/17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 458</td>
<td>Solving Big World Challenges</td>
<td>1/11/18</td>
<td>Requested from department. Recommended for approval 11/16/17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 587</td>
<td>Educational Foundations and Current Issues</td>
<td>1/18/18</td>
<td>Requested for approval 1/18/18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 431</td>
<td>World Population: Processes and Problems</td>
<td>9/21/17</td>
<td>Requested for approval 11/30/17 and conditionally recommended for approval. Recommended for approval 1/12/18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Business Items:
A. Resolution on Academic Program Review: Ken Brown, Chair of the Program Review Task Force, first reading: (pp. 6-10).
B. Resolution on Modifications to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate Election of Part-Time Academic Employee Representative: Dustin Stegner, Chair of the Academic Senate, first reading (pp. 11-12).

VII. Discussion Item(s):

VIII. Adjournment:
Minutes of the Academic Senate
Tuesday, January 23, 2018
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve the minutes of the November 14, 2017 and November 28, 2017 Academic Senate Meetings.

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair (Stegner): Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, reported on future items that will be coming to the Academic Senate in the Winter Quarter, such as a proposal on revising program review policies, a proposal from the Office Hours Task Force, GWR expansion, and the University’s Strategic Plan.

B. President’s Office (Darin): Jessica Darin, President’s Chief of Staff, reported on President Armstrong’s upcoming participation in a presentation regarding operational effectiveness, the Cal Poly Cloud Innovation Center, and the role of the digital transformation hub that partners with Amazon Web Services (AWS). The President will also have his 6-year review sent to the Board of Trustees, who will have a closed session discussion. The final proposal for the Oppenheimer Family Riding Pavilion, Stallion Barn, and Fowling Barn have been received. Lastly, CSU’s Wang Family Excellence Award recipient is Suzanne Phelan, Kinesiology and Public Health Department. More information on the award may be found at https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/wang-award.

C. Provost (Enz Finken): Kathleen Enz Finken, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, reported that the Dean searches for the College of Engineering, College of Liberal Arts, and the Library are underway. Department heads and chairs will be part of the workshop for enrollment management to finalize the number of students in their respective programs, with admissions compiling the pieces into the new system. Cal Poly was successful in receiving $150,000 of their requested $300,000 for a Faculty Diversity Grant. Enz Finken also announced that she has received the first round of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) evaluations.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs (Humphrey): Keith Humphrey, Vice President of Student Affairs, reported on a new program emphasizing the peer to peer aspect of bystander intervention that will be called “With Us.” University Housing is almost ready to begin accepting housing applications for the next academic year.

E. Statewide Senate (Laver/LoCascio): Jim LoCascio, Statewide Senator, reported on Project Rebound which is a program focused on helping formerly incarcerated students apply, enroll, and graduate with a degree from participating CSU campuses, as well as statewide discussions on the definition of student success. Gary Laver, Statewide Senator, reported that there will be a discussion on shared governance at the upcoming Statewide Academic Senate meeting.
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IV. Special Report:
A. Student Ombuds Services Update. Patricia Ponce, University Ombuds, presented on the standards of practice of the Student Ombuds Services and provided historical data on the uses of the services. The presentation is available for view at https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/Senate_Ombuds_Report.pdf.

V. Business Item: none.

VI. Discussion Item:
A. 2018-2020 Senate Membership. Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, reminded caucuses to encourage faculty to fill senate vacancies for the 2018-2020 term.

VII. Adjournment: 4:45 P.M.

Submitted by,

[Signature]

Denise Hensley
Academic Senate Student Assistant
Guiding Principles (DRAFT)

The General Education (GE) Task Force developed a set of guiding principles based on internal discussions, discussions with the GE Governance Board, conversations with stakeholders, research into current best practices, and recommendations from GE Program Review. The following are guiding Task Force deliberations and our development of program recommendations.

At Cal Poly, we seek a General Education Program that:

1. Provides a structure that enables, encourages, and strengthens meaning making.
2. Strives to make its structure and requirements clear to all stakeholders.
3. Advances the university mission by emphasizing values inherent in diversity and inclusivity.
4. Builds upon our unique strengths as a comprehensive polytechnic institution and distinguishes itself through innovation, Learn by Doing, and collaboration.
5. Evolves, adapts, and improves through the use of well-defined educational objectives, efficient assessment, and evidence-based decision-making.

Task Force Recommendations

The General Education (GE) Task Force is developing a set of recommendations to share with the campus community. In drafting these recommendations, the Task Force is drawing on ideas and feedback collected during our ongoing discussions with program stakeholders. In addition, the group is relying on a set of guiding principles (see above), its own deliberations and discussions, research into best practices, conversations with peer institutions, and feedback collected during program review. The recommendations fall into five categories: Curriculum Structure, Pathways and Integration, Course Design, Message and Outreach, and Program Management and Assessment. When presented to stakeholders for comment, each recommendation will include design and development options, the rationale for proposed changes, and potential implementation challenges.

Timeline for Upcoming Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop draft recommendations and program development options</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present recommendations and collect feedback during meetings and workshops with program stakeholders, including the Academic Senate</td>
<td>Winter &amp; Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and synthesize feedback from stakeholders</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a draft report and action plan</td>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review recommendations and the draft report with the Academic Senate during a fall workshop or retreat</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit a final report and action plan to the Academic Senate</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement approved recommendations and the associated action plan</td>
<td>Winter 2019 &amp; beyond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION ON ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

BACKGROUND: In 2016, the Academic Senate convened the Program Review Task Force, consisting of faculty, college administrators, and representation from the office of Academic Programs and Planning to review current practice related to academic program review and recommend to the Senate revisions to the relevant policies and procedures. The Program Review Task Force obtained feedback from faculty recently or currently involved in program review about best practices. Careful consideration of this feedback strongly suggests that annual revisiting of the outcomes of the program review in action plans would allow for an extension of the program review cycle for non-accredited programs from six to seven years. Accredited programs should continue to conduct program review at least every five years according to the cycle for renewal of accreditation.

WHEREAS, The Academic Programs and Planning website provides information on academic program review, including revised templates developed for the current cycle and based on informed judgment about best practices in program review and feedback from faculty involved in program review; and

WHEREAS, Policies and procedures for academic program review last formulated in 2000 (AS-552-00) and revised slightly in 2010 (AS-718-10) do not reflect current practices for academic program review; and

WHEREAS, Annual updates to program review action plans allow for the modest extension of the program review cycle for non-accredited programs from six to seven years; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate adopts the attached “Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures.”

Proposed by: Program Review Task Force
Date: January 25, 2018
ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
Prepared by the Program Review Task Force
Winter 2018

Guiding Principles. Academic program review (APR) is a comprehensive and periodic review of academic programs, including General Education and interdisciplinary programs. APR is a function of the Provost, in conjunction with the College Deans, the Academic Senate, and the Dean of Graduate Education, and is coordinated by the office of Academic Programs and Planning (APP).

The goal of APR is to improve the quality and viability of each academic program by encouraging self study and strategic planning within programs. APR is not a review of academic departments as such, although it will inevitably address departmental issues. Each program, department, and college is responsible for making curricular decisions and programmatic offerings within existing resources. All such decisions shall be the purview of the faculty of the program, department, and/or college. Hence, APR should inform and be an essential component of academic planning and curriculum, budgeting, and accountability to internal and external audiences. APR provides information for planning decisions at every administrative level.

Academic program review of programs subject to professional or specialized accreditation or recognition will be coordinated to coincide with the accreditation/recognition review whenever possible. Documentation developed for accreditation/recognition reviews may already provide the essential requirements of APR, and, thus, may also be used for this purpose, but it is important to note that accreditation/recognition reviews can serve a different purpose than program reviews.

Definitions. The following definitions should help in distinguishing terms used throughout this document:

- **Academic Program**: a structured grouping of course work designed to meet an educational objective and usually leading to a baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate degree, or to a teaching credential. CSU policy defines General Education as an academic program.
- **Department**: an administrative unit that manages one or more academic programs.
- **Program Administrator**: the individual administratively responsible for the Program, whether a head, chair, or director.
- **Program Representatives**: the Program Administrator and other Program faculty members participating in the design and production of the self-study report.
- **Program Review Team**: the external reviewers appointed to conduct the site visit and compose the program review report.

Roles and Responsibilities. As required by the CSU Board of Trustees, academic programs should be reviewed every five to ten years. Wherever possible, APR will coincide with external accreditation/recognition. Programs with ten-year accreditation cycles will have an interim review. All non-accredited academic programs, including General Education, will be reviewed on a seven-year cycle. This schedule may be accelerated in individual cases either at the discretion of the Provost or College Dean, in consultation with the Program faculty, or in compliance with recommendations from prior program reviews. Programs in related disciplines or with similar missions may be reviewed on
concurrent cycles.

The Provost initiates APR through the Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, in collaboration with the College Dean and the Dean of Graduate Education.

Each APR is conducted by the Program Review Team (Team). Reviewers should be knowledgeable in the discipline/field of the program under review while bringing a perspective that comes from outside of the college or institution. The Program Administrator submits reviewer nominations to the College Dean who makes the final Team selection. The Team will normally be composed of (at least) three members to be selected using the following guidelines:

- One member internal to Cal Poly from a college different than that of the program under review
- Two external members representing the discipline of the program under review

The Team Chair will be identified, and one Team member will be the designated assessment reviewer to ensure that appropriate attention is given to this topic. The composition of the Team may change when the academic program review coincides with an accreditation/recognition review. In these instances, the role of the internal reviewer will be negotiated based on allowances of the accrediting/recognition body.

The APR process is intended to close the circle of inquiry, review, and improvement. Program Representatives and the Program Review Team assume distinct roles in the APR process:

- The self-study report is completed by the Program Representatives.
- The review of the self-study report and the site-visit is conducted by the Program Review Team, which documents its findings in the Team report.
- The strategic action plan is prepared by the Program Representatives, based on the findings of the self-study and the Team reports.

**Elements of the Self-Study Report.** In preparation for the review, the Program will undertake a thorough self study that addresses the program’s mission, capacity (resources available to fulfill the mission), and effectiveness (the degree to which a program achieves its mission), all within the context of the College and University. To accomplish this objective, the inquiry-based self-study report consists of topics such as the following:

- Program Identity (e.g., history, context, mission, and progress since the last review)
- Program Elements (e.g., learning objectives, curriculum, and pedagogy)
- Program Resources (e.g., faculty, facilities, equipment, information resources, and budget)
- Program Effectiveness (e.g., student learning, persistence and graduation rates, student engagement, graduate success)
- Program Planning (e.g., admissions, instructional capacity, and employer demand)
- Program, University and/or System-Wide Themes (e.g., diversity and inclusion)

This outline is provided as an example. In the spirit of continuous improvement, specific elements of the self-study report template will be modified and improved as needed in response to institutional priorities and feedback provided by programs undergoing review. The current version of the self-
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study report template will be accessible on the APP website.

Programs undergoing accreditation review may be asked to produce a supplemental document addressing the concerns of APR that are not addressed in the accreditation/recognition review.

APP will distribute the self-study report to the Team, College Dean, Provost, and the Dean of Graduate Education.

**Site Visit and Team Report.** Ideally, the Team will receive a copy of the self-study report around a month prior to the site visit. All Team members should read the self-study report and are encouraged to request additional materials as needed. A two-day site visit will be coordinated by the Department, in consultation with the College Dean and APP.

During the site visit, the Team will have access to the faculty, staff, students, and administrators, as well as any additional documentation or appointments deemed necessary for completion of the review. During the site visit, the Team should be provided with sufficient time to discuss their findings amongst themselves. The Team should also be given the opportunity to meet with the Program Representatives, including the Program Administrator, the College Dean, and the Provost to discuss possible outcomes of the review at the end of the site visit. It is the responsibility of the Team Chair to ensure that members of the Team work together throughout the review and that the final report reflects the input of all reviewers.

Within one month of the site visit, the Team will provide a draft report to APP for distribution to the Program Administrator, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable). In addition to commendations, the report should address the major issues facing the Program and the Program's discipline and suggest strategies for improvement. The Program Representatives will review the draft report solely for accuracy. After this review, a final Team report will be submitted to APP for distribution to the Program Administrator, College Dean, the Dean of Graduate Education, and the Provost.

**Strategic Action Planning.** The effectiveness of APR depends on the implementation of the appropriate recommendations contained in the Team report as well as insights gained during the self-study process. Based on these factors, the Program Representatives will draft a strategic action plan that responds to the findings of the self-study and the Team reports. An action plan meeting will be scheduled by APP, to include the Department, the College Dean, representatives from APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable). The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the strategic action plan, obtaining input, feedback and support from the College Dean and others in attendance. Based on the feedback provided during the meeting, a finalized action plan is submitted to the College Dean, APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education. The Program Administrator and Program Representatives review the strategic action plan, update it if necessary, and provide APP with a copy on an annual basis, where it becomes a part of the program's institutional record.
A copy of the self-study report, Team report, and the strategic action plan will be kept on file with APP for two APR cycles. An annual APR summary will be prepared by APP for the Academic Senate.

Process Summary. The APR process can be summarized as follows:

1. The office of Academic Programs and Planning (APP) notifies the programs to be reviewed during spring quarter of the academic year before the academic year in which the department will produce the self-study.

2. For each program under review, a Program Review Team (Team) is appointed. The willingness to be involved and the availability of the Team members for the entire review process should be secured well in advance. The procedures and charge to the Team, including reading the self-study and conducting a site visit, must also be communicated prior to the review.

3. The Program Administrator, College Dean, APP, and Dean of Graduate Education (as applicable) establish a schedule for completion of the review.

4. APP, in consultation with the College Dean, Program Administrator, and the Dean of Graduate Education will determine whether an accreditation/recognition review process covers the essential elements of APR in accordance with any CSU or Cal Poly mandated requirements. As appropriate, a supplemental document may be required.

5. The Program Representatives conduct the self-study, and the Program Administrator submits copies of the initial draft of the self-study report to APP, the Associate Dean, and, the Dean of Graduate Education. Feedback on the initial draft is provided to the Program Administrator.

6. The Program Administrator submits a finalized self-study report to APP for distribution to the Team, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education around a month prior to the scheduled site visit.

7. The Team reviews the self-study report, requesting additional materials as needed, and conducts a two-day site visit. The visit is coordinated by the Department, in consultation with the College Dean and APP, and should include meetings with the Program faculty, staff, students, as well as administrators within the Department, College, and University.

8. The Team submits a draft report to APP within one month of the site visit for distribution to the Program. The Program Representatives review the draft for accuracy, and the Program Administrator requests corrections from the Team as necessary.

9. The Team submits the final report (if revisions are required) to APP for distribution to the Program, College Dean, and the Dean of Graduate Education.

10. The Program Representatives draft a strategic action plan based on the findings of the self-study and Team reports. The draft plan is submitted to the Department, the College Dean, APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education.

11. A meeting is scheduled to discuss the draft action plan with the Department, the College Dean, representatives from APP, and the Dean of Graduate Education. Based on input provided during the meeting, revisions are made to the draft plan resulting in a finalized action plan that can be approved by the Dean.

12. The Program Representatives review and the Program Administrator updates the strategic action plan on an annual basis.

13. Copies of all finalized documents are kept on file with APP for two APR cycles.
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RESOLUTION ON MODIFICATIONS TO THE BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
ELECTION OF PART-TIME ACADEMIC EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE

WHEREAS, The participation and voice of part-time lecturers in an academic
department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional
Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the
General Faculty, is encouraged and valued; and

WHEREAS, Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and
part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than
those who are members of the General Faculty, are represented by
one voting member in the Senate; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws of the Academic Senate be modified as shown on the
attached copy.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: January 24, 2018
CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY

ARTICLE III. THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Section 1. Membership
(c) Part-time lecturers in an academic department/teaching area and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services, other than those who are members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I, will be represented by one voting member in the Senate.

BYLAWS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

I. INTRODUCTION

B. DEFINITIONS
4. Part-time Academic Employees
Part-time lecturers in academic departments/teaching areas in the University and part-time employees in Professional Consultative Services (Professional Consultative Services classifications: librarians, counselors, student service professionals I-, II-, III-academically related, student service professionals III and IV, physicians, and coaches) who are not members of the General Faculty as defined in Article I of the Constitution of the Faculty.

II. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

A. ELIGIBILITY
3. Representative of Part-time Academic Employees
A voting member of the Academic Senate representing part-time academic employees shall be elected by vote of all university part-time academic employees during fall quarter of each academic year. Such representative must have an academic year appointment in order to serve in this position.

B. TERMS OF OFFICE
1. Terms of office for senators: the elected term of office for senators shall be two years. A senator can serve a maximum of two consecutive, elected terms and shall not again be eligible for election until one year has elapsed. A senator appointed to fill a temporary vacancy for an elected position shall serve until the completion of that term or until the senator being temporarily replaced returns, whichever occurs first. If this temporary appointment is for one year or less, it shall not be counted as part of the two-term maximum for elected senators. The term of the representative for part-time academic employees shall start immediately after the election and last until elections are held the following academic year. The representative for part-time academic employees shall serve a one-year term with a maximum of four consecutive one-year terms.

III. VOTING AND ELECTION PROCEDURES

B. ELECTION CALENDAR
8. Election of representative for part-time academic employees:
(a) during the first weeks of fall quarter, the Academic Senate office shall solicit nominations for the position of Academic Senate representative for part-time academic employees.
(b) after nominations have been received, election to this position shall be conducted. A runoff election, if needed, shall be conducted the week following the conclusion of the election. Said position shall be elected by vote of all university part-time academic employees unless only one nomination to this position is received, in which case the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall have the authority to appoint said nominee to the position.
(c) the term of the elected member shall start immediately after the election and serve until the end of the academic year elections are held the following academic year.