Meeting of the Academic Senate  
Tuesday, March 3, 2020  
UU 220, 3:10 to 5:00 pm

I. Minutes: February 11, 2020 minutes (pp. 3-4)

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

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. Provost: (p. 5)
C. Vice President for Student Affairs: (p. 6)
D. Statewide Senate: (p. 7)
E. CFA: (p. 8)
F. ASI: (p. 9)

IV. Special Reports:
A. [TIME CERTAIN 3:15 p.m.] President’s Report: President Armstrong
B. University Advising Written Update: Beth Miller, Assistant Vice Provost for University Advising (p. 10)
C. Ombuds Services Update Written Report: Patricia Ponce, Student Ombuds (p. 11)

V. Consent Agenda:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS TO BE CONSIDERED BY ACADEMIC SENATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name or Course Number, Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL 339 Introduction to Shakespeare (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(existing course proposed to be offered online)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. **Business Items:**
A. **Election of 2020-2021 Academic Senate Officers**
B. **Resolution on Subject Area Guidelines (II) for General Education 2020:** Gary Laver, GE Governance Board, first reading (pp. 12-27)
C. **Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 6.3: Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern:**
   Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee, first reading (pp. 28-34)
D. **Resolution in Support of Resolution AS-3403-19/AA: Recommended Implantation of a California State University (CSU) Ethnic Studies Requirement from the Academic Senate of the CSU:** Steve Rein, Statewide Academic Senate, Cal Poly Academic Senate Executive Committee, first reading (pp. 35-41)
E. **Resolution on Discontinuation of M.S of Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging Degree Program:** Colleen Twomey, Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, first reading (pp. 42-43)
F. **Resolution on Class Attendance:** Jerusha Greenwood, Ashlee Hernandez, Alan Faz, Tess Loarie and Kylie Clark, first reading (pp. 44-58)

VII. **Discussion Item(s):**

VIII. **Adjournment:**
I. Minutes: M/S/P to approve of the January 28, 2020 Academic Senate meeting minutes.

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

Reports:

III. All reports were submitted in writing at the request of the Senate Chair. The reports can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/sa021120.pdf

IV. Consent Agenda

V. Special Reports:

A. 2-Year Housing Requirement Implantation: Jo Campbell, Executive Director of University Housing, gave a report on the current status of University housing as well as presented the body with a report on the 2 Year Housing Requirement. Reports can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/UH_2-Year-Requirement-One-Sheet-Official_8.5x11_2019_v9-no%20bleed_0.pdf AND https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/Academic%20Senate%202020%20year%20housing%20requirement.pdf Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair, requested that the freshmen retention to third year student status report also be included in the minutes and can be found at: https://content-calpoly-edu.s3.amazonaws.com/academicsenate/1/images/SAcademic%20S2021208570.pdf

VI. Business Items:

A. Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 12.2: Office Hours: Ken Brown, Academic senate Faculty Affairs Committee, presented a resolution that created subchapter 12.2: Office Hours for the University Faculty Personnel Policy. M/S/P to move the Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 12.2: Office Hours to second reading. M/S/P to approve the Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 12.2: Office Hours

B. Resolution on Subject Area Guidelines (II) for General Education 2020: Gary Laver, GE Governance Board, presented a resolution establishing new guidelines for Areas C, D and E general education courses for the 2020-2021 and subsequent catalogs that reflect EO 1100. This resolution will return in first reading status at the next Academic Senate meeting.
C. **Resolution on Adding a Sustainability Catalog Option to Schedule Builder:** David Bruan, Academic Senate Sustainability Committee Chair, introduced a resolution that would introduce a new feature to Schedule Builder to allow users to specifically search for SUSCAT classes, or classes that deal with sustainability. M/S/P to move the Resolution on Adding a Sustainability Catalog Option to Schedule Builder to second reading. M/S/P to approve the Resolution on Adding a Sustainability Catalog Option to Schedule Builder. Two opposed, one abstention.

D. **Resolution on University Faculty Personnel Policies Subchapter 6.3: Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern:** Ken Brown, Faculty Affairs Committee, introduced a resolution updating subchapter 6.3 of University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) to propose changes regarding post-tenured faculty evaluations patterns. This resolution will return to the Academic Senate in first reading status next meeting.

VII. **Discussion Item(s):**

VIII. **Adjournment:** 5:00 pm

Submitted by,

Francisca Tiesi
Graduation Initiative (GI)
Current GI efforts include piloting interventions in courses with higher fail rates, targeting active/not enrolled students to support their return, continuing to expand the role of the newly opened Transfer Center, conducting student focus groups as a part of our Data Champions work, and implementing the new Schedule Builder and Degree Planner Software.

Cal Poly (CP) Scholars Program Task Force
The 18-member Task Force includes five CP Scholars, four faculty members, and nine staff/management personnel from various entities across campus, including Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and University Advising. The group’s original charge was to develop a multi-year plan to enhance and expand a university-wide CP Scholars Program.

Since fall 2019, the Task Force has held nine meetings to learn about the program and its students, discuss current and best practices for similar programs, and identify challenges facing the program as it expands to approximately 3,000 students over the next four to five years. To better understand the program strengths and needs, the Task Force members meet regularly with CP Scholars to review the student surveys and program assessment results. Past and future meeting guests include Scholars Program staff members, Admissions and Financial Aid office representatives, and staff from the EOP and TRIO offices.

During the winter 2020 and spring 2020 terms, Task Force discussions and research are focused on: community development and programming; balancing student and program funding needs; advising, faculty advising, and peer mentoring; academics, including courses, support services, curriculum, and faculty participation; program assessment and review; staffing and university-wide collaborative efforts; and transition planning. The Task Force will complete its work by drafting and finalizing a set of program recommendations that they will present to President Armstrong during summer 2020.
Student Affairs Report to Senate
March 3, 2020
Keith Humphrey
Vice President for Student Affairs

• Cal Poly Student Affairs leaders/departments will receive the following national recognitions:
  o *Most Promising Place to Work in Student Affairs* official recognition by Diverse Magazine at the ACPA-College Student Educators International Convention
  o Dr. Jo Campbell, Associate VP for Student Affairs, will receive the ACPA Annuit Coeptis Senior Professional recognition (awarded annually to three senior professionals nationally).
  o Travis Reynaud and Hannah Steen (Career Services) will receive the Commitment to Social Justice in Career Services Award from the ACPA Commission on Career Services.
  o Andrene Kaiwi will receive a Circle of Excellence Honor from the National Orientation Director’s Association.

• Campus Health and Wellbeing continues to work closely with SLO County Public Health, International Programs, and International Programs to monitor the coronavirus and will communicate if there is any public health concern for the Cal Poly community.
Statewide Senate Report 3-3-20

Steve Rein:

The Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee (FGA) had a virtual meeting on Feb 21 where we discussed:

- lobbying efforts related to AB 1460 (ASCSU is opposed)
- identifying bills that are related to the CSU where the ASCSU would possibly want to take a position
- advocacy day this year will be Wed, April 15: members of FGA plus a few other ASCSU representatives will be in Sacramento to let legislators know the ASCSU position on the issues identified as important
CFA Senate Report 3-3-20

CFA SLO will be holding a chapter meeting on Thursday, March 5, from 11:10 AM to 1:00 PM, in Building 5 Room 104. All CFA members are encouraged to attend. Faculty who are not yet CFA members may sign a membership card at the door and then attend the meeting. The main topic of the meeting will be contract bargaining. We will also discuss CFA’s current political actions, as well as local Cal Poly issues.

CFA continues to support AB 1460, a bill that would establish a systemwide CSU graduation requirement in ethnic studies. There is well-established precedent for the California state legislature to establish curricular requirements for the CSU; a notable example is the Title 5, Section 40404 “American Institutions” requirement, which the Cal Poly Academic Senate unanimously reaffirmed in 2011. The Academic Senate of the CSU is currently developing its own ethnic studies graduation requirement. However, CFA still believes that it is important to pass AB 1460. It is unclear whether or when the CSU would implement the ASCSU’s proposed requirement. There is no way to know whether the CSU’s new Chancellor will support the ASCSU’s requirement. If the CSU does implement the ASCSU’s proposed requirement, a future CSU administration could always repeal it. AB 1460, on the other hand, would create a permanent graduation requirement in ethnic studies. The text of AB 1460 is available here: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB1460

Bill Text - AB-1460 California State University: graduation requirement: ethnic studies.
This bill, commencing with the 2020–21 2021–22 academic year, would require the California State University to provide for courses in ethnic studies at each of its campuses. The bill, commencing with the 2020–21 students graduating in the 2024–25 academic year, would require the California State University to require, as an undergraduate graduation requirement, the completion of, at ...
ASI Report for March 3, 2020 Academic Senate Meeting

- **Super Tuesday**: Today is the March 3rd Primary Election. For students living on-campus wanting to vote in person, they should go to the Cal Poly Recreation Center. All other students should vote in-person to their designated polling location which can be found online at [www.sos.ca.gov/elections/polling-place/](http://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/polling-place/).

- **IRA Process**: Mark Borges, Co-Chair of the Instructionally-Related Activities Advisory Committee, is in the process of meeting with the IRA Advisory Committee to review proposals for new IRAs. Funding for all IRAs will be determined and submitted as a recommendation for approval to President Armstrong in the spring.

- **Student-Community Liaison Committee (SCLC)**: Mark Borges, Co-Chair of SCLC, held a meeting last Thursday. The group heard a presentation from Campus Health and Wellbeing on how the center supports students and intersects with off-campus events. Additionally, the group convened a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Subcommittee based off the CPX survey results as it pertains to students, staff, and faculty's perceived experience in the community of San Luis Obispo.

- **California State Student Association**: Cal Poly hosted the February meeting of the California State Student Association during the weekend of February 15th and 16th. The Board took the following action at the meeting:
  - Passed a "Support" stance on Gender Equity in Education Bill (SB 493) By Senator Jackson
  - Passed a "Support" stance on End All Hazing Act (HR 3267) by Representative Fudge
  - Passed a "Sponsor" stance on Mandated Undocu-Ally Training Bill by Senator Limon
  - Approved a Resolution on Proposed Title IX Changes
  - Approved a Resolution in Support of the Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2020 (Proposition 13)
University Advising Updates –

Transfer Center:
• The Transfer Center opened the beginning of winter quarter. The Transfer Center Coordinator, Heather Domonoske, will work with Admissions, Evaluations, New Student and Transitions Program, University Housing, advisors, faculty, and staff to provide a more inclusive environment for Cal Poly transfer students. An official grand opening is tentatively planned for April 2020.

Mustang Success Center:
• Cal Poly is reimagining its advising structure in an effort to clearly articulate roles and responsibilities to students, staff, and faculty. The primary role of the Mustang Success Center will be to provide proactive advising services to first time freshmen. College advising centers, with the support of University Advising Retention Specialists will have the primary responsibility of serving second year students and beyond, as well as transfer students. Academic Year 2019-2020 is a transition year that entails communication and marketing, as well as program curriculum design. Implementation of the reimagined advising structure is expected to be completed by Fall 2020.
• The Mustang Success Center will continue to provide first and second year advising to Cal Poly Scholars, and advising for student-athletes.
Below summarizes the activities of Student Ombuds Services (SOS) for the 2018-2019 academic year. SOS welcomes all students to express any university concern they may have “off the record” and works to assist in identifying options for resolution. The Ombuds helps students resolve issues and serves as an alternative to more formal grievance processes.

SOS follows the International Ombudsman Association Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice; they include Confidentiality, Informality, Impartiality, and Independence.

Descriptive statistics below show that more women than men utilized Ombuds services. Engineering students used SOS most frequently followed by CLA, CAFES, CAED, COB, and COSAM. Seniors and Juniors comprised half of all cases. 225 different issues were brought to SOS. Grade issues continue to remain the most pressing concern among students. The 2018-19 trend data revealed a slight increase in the number of overall cases brought to SOS over time.

Sample Typical Ombuds case:

**Ombuds**: Clarifies guiding principles of Confidentiality, Informality, Impartiality, Independence, and breach of confidence for imminent risk of serious harm to self or others and sexual misconduct.

**Student**: Believes she was graded unfairly for missing class.

**Ombuds**: Review course syllabus for guidelines on missed coursework. Clarify if the student is under the care of a medical professional; is there documentation? Discuss, right not to reveal diagnosis, but may share verification of care. Inform student of campus policy regarding “missed coursework” e.g. AS 592 03/IC. Discuss effective communication with faculty either via email or in person.

**Student**: Positive outcome, student and faculty work out an arrangement to make up missed coursework.

The Office of Student Ombuds Services provides Cal Poly students with a confidential, informal, impartial and independent resource to assist in the resolution of university related concerns or complaints.

For more information contact: ombuds@calpoly.edu 805 756 1380
WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s Academic Senate has approved the *Template for General Education 2020*; and

WHEREAS, Implementation of the new *Template* requires the establishment of course criteria and educational objectives for all General Education courses; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached *Subject Area Guidelines* covering Areas C, D, and E in the *Template for General Education 2020*; and be it further

RESOLVED: That these *Guidelines* be used for the review and implementation of pre-existing and proposed General Education courses from Areas C, D, and E within the 2020–2021 and subsequent catalogs.

Proposed by: General Education Governance Board
Date: November 20, 2019
General Education

The General Education program is compliant with CSU requirements and is uniquely tailored to our comprehensive polytechnic education. At Cal Poly all curriculum, including general education curriculum, is designed and taught by faculty with appropriate training and disciplinary expertise. Educational objectives are expectations for student learning, achievement of which can be periodically assessed. Course criteria are expectations for course design that will be used in the consideration of the course proposal, course modifications, and course renewal. Educational objectives and course criteria for general education subject areas are included below. General education class instruction includes the opportunity for skill acquisition, development, evaluation, and self-reflection.

Arts and Humanities Lower-Division Courses Introduction

Area C

In Area C students explore the human condition as expressed in literature, philosophy, and the arts. Courses in this area expose students to broad achievements in the arts and humanities that changed and/or continue to change how we understand ourselves emotionally, intellectually, and culturally. These courses seek to improve and encourage students' ability to read with critical judgment and write with clarity. These courses emphasize writing as an integral part of the process of learning and discovery. They also cultivate an awareness of language and the arts as forms of expression valuable both in themselves and for developing critical awareness. By placing basic knowledge in a larger context, these courses provide a vision of why the arts and humanities are important to well-rounded university graduates. Lower-division courses provide a broad foundation for in depth experiences in upper-division courses.

Activities in Area C1 may include participation in individual aesthetic, creative experiences; however, courses that primarily emphasize skills development and/or professional preparation are excluded from Area C.

Students may take courses in languages other than English in partial fulfillment of the Area C requirement if the courses do not focus primarily on skills acquisition but also contain a substantial cultural component. This may include literature among other content.

Area C Educational Objectives and Criteria

C1 Arts – Lower-Division Educational Objectives

Consistent with the EO 1100-R and Cal Poly’s current General Education program, “arts” in the GE program means architecture, cinema, dance, music, theater, visual arts, and related fields.
Upon completion of a qualifying C1 course, students should be able to:

EO1 Describe key aesthetic developments in the arts, including formal, material, and/or technical innovations as well as contributions made by individuals from diverse and/or underrepresented groups\(^1\);

EO2 Summarize key historical and contemporary developments in the arts, including contributions made by individuals from diverse and/or underrepresented groups; relate these developments to their broader social, political, and/or historical contexts;

EO3 Explain and/or employ relevant artistic skills and techniques to explore the possibilities and limitations of aesthetic form as an expressive medium and the relationships between form and content;

EO4 Differentiate between subjective and objective responses to aesthetic experiences and/or works of art;

EO5 Analyze subjective and objective responses to aesthetic experiences and/or works of art;

EO6 Apply critical standards/frameworks to evaluate and interpret the cultural significance of canonical and non-canonical works of art, including works from diverse and/or underrepresented groups and traditions.

**C1 Arts – Lower-Division Criteria**

The course proposal and expanded outline for lower-division Area C1 courses must clearly indicate how they meet all of these criteria:

CR1 Develop skills in historical and critical analysis;

CR2 Courses with laboratory or activity components develop skills in at least one particular area of practice in the arts;

CR3 Instructional materials and course content (e.g., readings, examples used in class, course assignments) incorporate contributions made by individuals from diverse and/or underrepresented groups;

CR4 As appropriate, address issues of sustainability;

---

\(^1\) By “diverse” we intend the definition of diversity found in the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity and Inclusivity ([https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1807&context=senateresolutions](https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1807&context=senateresolutions)). By “underrepresented groups” is intended groups who are currently underrepresented and historically marginalized groups.
CR5 Require disciplinary appropriate writing assignments that comprise at least 10% of overall course grade.

C2 Literature – Lower-Division Educational Objectives

All C2 literature courses must satisfy the following educational objectives and criteria.

Upon completion of a qualifying C2 course, students should be able to:

EO1 Identify and define an array of historical and critical literary terms, categories, and conventions;

EO2 Read, analyze, and interpret literary texts with insight, engagement, discernment, and empathy;

EO3 Explicate texts from a diverse range of traditions, including texts from historically underrepresented groups;

EO4 Critique texts that account for the rhetorical relationships among writer, audience, text, and genre;

EO5 Analyze how power structures and how social, cultural, and historical contexts shape literary production and reception.

C2 Literature – Lower-Division Criteria

The course proposal and expanded outline for lower-division Area C2 courses must clearly indicate how they meet all of these criteria:

CR1 Enrollment prerequisites list completion of Area A;

CR2 Compare and contrast a wide range of literary traditions, including works from historically underrepresented groups, from a period covering two hundred years or more;

CR3 Instructional materials and course content (e.g., readings, examples used in class, course assignments) incorporate contributions made by individuals from diverse and/or underrepresented groups;

CR4 As appropriate, address issues of sustainability;

CR5 Meet all other criteria for GE writing-intensive courses (GE Writing Intensive Requirements).
C2 Philosophy – Lower-Division Educational Objectives

Upon completion of a qualifying C2 course, students should be able to:

EO1 Read philosophy with a focus on impartiality, careful insight, and engagement;
EO2 Critically compare a historically diverse range of philosophical movements and their relationship to other intellectual movements;
EO3 Critically examine the implications of holding a particular philosophical position;
EO4 Integrate philosophical arguments into a holistic philosophical view;
EO5 Apply philosophical methods to analyze and evaluate a variety of positions.

C2 Philosophy – Lower-Division Criteria

The course proposal and expanded outline for lower-division Area C2 courses must clearly indicate how they meet all of these criteria:

CR1 Enrollment prerequisites list completion of Area A;
CR2 Include at least one ancient or medieval work, at least one modern work, and no more than one work from the 20th and 21st century;
CR3 Rely upon primary texts for readings;
CR4 Include recognized accomplishments in philosophy;
CR5 Address (e.g., readings, course assignments) issues of diversity and inclusion;
CR6 As appropriate, address issues of sustainability;
CR7 Meet all other criteria for GE writing-intensive courses (GE Writing Intensive Requirements).

C2 Study Abroad Languages Other than English – Lower-division Educational Objectives

Cal Poly study abroad courses (such as SPAN 141-142-143 and SPAN 241-242-243) would be included in this area. In compliance with EO 1100-R, these courses contain a substantial cultural component because they are taken in the context of full immersion in the target language and culture.

Upon completion of a qualifying C2 study abroad course, students should be able to:
EO1 Demonstrate communicative and cultural competence that will enable them to participate actively and appropriately in the target language culture;

EO2 Recognize cultural development reflected in changing language use, including the significance of evolving technology in the development of the target language;

EO3 Describe the social, cultural, and historical contexts specific to the language being studied, including differences between various registers of language use;

EO4 Identify and analyze diverse perspectives based on linguistic and cultural heritage.

C2 Study Abroad Languages Other than English – Lower-Division Criteria

The course proposal and expanded outline for lower-division Area C2 courses must clearly indicate how they meet all of these criteria:

CR1 Enrollment prerequisites list completion of Area A;

CR2 Develop speaking, listening, reading, and writing abilities at an intermediate level or above;

CR3 Provide a wide variety of activities and materials designed to develop students’ communicative and cultural competence;

CR4 Emphasize an understanding of language in its socio-cultural context;

CR5 Instructional materials and course content (e.g., readings, examples used in class, course assignments) incorporate contributions made by individuals from diverse and/or underrepresented groups;

CR6 As appropriate, address issues of sustainability;

CR7 Meet all other criteria for GE writing-intensive courses (GE Writing Intensive Requirements).

Upper-Division C – Arts and Humanities

These courses must be integrative in nature, requiring the application and generalization of knowledge and/or understanding from foundation Area C courses (as appropriate) to the advanced study of a subject or to new, but related, areas of inquiry within the arts and humanities. These courses may be interdisciplinary in nature and should focus on achieving depth rather than breadth. Courses in this area also emphasize writing as an integral part of the process of learning and discovery.
Upper-Division C Educational Objectives

Upon completion of a qualifying upper-division Area C course, students should be able to:

EO1 Integrate factual and conceptual knowledge in the arts or the humanities to the advanced study of a subject or to new, but related, areas of inquiry;

EO2 Evaluate issues in the arts or the humanities, including issues of diversity and inclusion;

EO3 Critically analyze a focused area of study in the arts or the humanities;

EO4 Evaluate how relationships between different areas of study in the arts or the humanities provide additional perspectives on knowledge.

Upper-Division C Criteria

The course proposal and expanded outline for upper-division Area C courses must clearly indicate how they meet all of these criteria:

CR1 Enrollment prerequisites list completion of Areas A1 Oral Communication, A2 Written Communication, and A3 Critical Thinking, and B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning as pursuant to EO1100 Revised (section 2.2.3) and C1 or C2; some courses will require additional pre-requisites as course content dictates;

CR2 Explore in depth a subject related to the disciplinary/interdisciplinary study of the arts and/or humanities;

CR3 Demonstrate the subject's relationship to other cultural achievements and to relevant issues of diversity and inclusion;

CR4 Instructional materials and course content (e.g., readings, examples used in class, course assignments) incorporate contributions made by individuals from diverse and/or underrepresented groups;

CR5 As appropriate, address issues of sustainability;

CR6 Meet all other criteria for GE writing-intensive courses (GE Writing Intensive Requirements).
Social Sciences

Area D

Area D provides students with an understanding of how social, political, and economic institutions and behaviors are historically and inextricably interwoven. Students learn, via social scientific inquiry, how the human experience is shaped by broad societal and cultural traditions and structures as well as by individual factors. Courses in this area also emphasize writing as an integral part of the process of learning and discovery. Courses that emphasize skills development and professional preparation are excluded from Area D. Lower-division courses provide a broad foundation for in depth experiences in upper-division courses.

Area D Lower-Division Social Science Educational Objectives

Upon completion of a qualifying lower-division D course, students should be able to meet five or more of the following eight educational objectives:

EO1 Describe how communities have historically grouped together;

EO2 Describe how groups and individuals develop social, economic, political, and legal institutions and relationships that are important for themselves as individuals and the welfare of their communities;

EO3 Provide examples of the origins and meaning of the public order, commerce, and social institutions;

EO4 Interpret the histories of western and non-western societies in a cross-cultural, global perspective and recognize the growing interdependence of the global community;

EO5 Analyze the ways that social, political, and economic institutions and human behavior are interconnected;

EO6 Examine the human experience in comparative terms through an understanding of the diversity of experience from both individual and group perspectives with special attention to the issues of diversity such as gender, ethnicity, and race;

EO7 Examine the structural relationships between diversity, inequality, and social, economic, and/or political power;

EO8 Examine the contributions of the extant literature and research methodologies related to the study of social, economic, political, and/or legal issues in a global society;
D1 Lower-Division: American Institutions (4 units)

Criteria for courses that meet the American Institutions and 40404 requirement

In addition to meeting five or more of the eight educational objectives for lower-division Area D, the course proposal and expanded course outline for courses in American Institutions and 40404 must clearly indicate how the course meets all of the following criteria:

CR1 Address significant events covering a minimum time span of approximately one hundred years and occurring in the entire area now included in the United States of America, including the relationships of regions within that area and with external regions and powers as appropriate to the understanding of those events within the United States during the period under study;

CR2 Incorporate the role of major ethnic and social groups in such events and the contexts in which the events have occurred;

CR3 Cover the events presented within a framework that illustrates the continuity of the American experience and its derivation from other cultures, including consideration of three or more of the following: politics, economics, social movements, and geography;

CR4 Incorporate the political philosophies of the framers of the Constitution and the nature and operation of United States political institutions and processes under that Constitution as amended and interpreted;

CR5 Highlight the rights and obligations of citizens in the political system established under the Constitution;

CR6 Include the Constitution of the state of California within the framework of evolution of federal-state relations and the nature and processes of state and local government under that Constitution;

CR7 Explore the contemporary relationships of state and local government with the federal government, the resolution of conflicts and the establishment of cooperative processes under the constitutions of both the state and nation, and the political processes involved;

CR8 Require disciplinary appropriate writing assignments that comprise at least 10% of overall course grade.

Area D2 Lower-Division (8 units)

(excludes American Institutions and 40404 requirement)

The course proposal and expanded outline for lower-division Area D courses must clearly indicate how they meet all of these criteria:
CR1 Address the origins, structures, functions, patterns of change, and integration of basic human social institutions (for example, family, government, economy, education, and/or religion);

CR2 Include relevant research methodologies;

CR3 Explore social phenomena from non-western, cross-cultural, comparative, and/or global perspectives;

CR4 Examine cultural and/or social diversity, including the drivers of ethnic, gender, and class-based inequality;

CR5 Apply theory to practical current issues;

CR6 Require disciplinary appropriate writing assignments that comprise at least 10% of overall course grade.

**Upper-Division D (4 units)**

Courses must be integrative in nature, requiring application and generalization of knowledge and understanding from foundation Area D courses to the advanced study of a subject or to new, but related, areas of inquiry. These courses may be interdisciplinary in nature and should focus on achieving depth rather than breadth. Courses in this area also emphasize writing as an integral part of the process of learning and discovery. Attention to issues of gender and diversity is encouraged. Courses require the completion of two lower-division Area D.

**Upper-Division D Educational Objectives**

Upon completion of a qualifying upper-division D course, students should be able to:

EO1 Examine problems and issues from their respective disciplinary perspectives;

EO2 Develop reasoned, logical, evidence-based arguments that expand upon lower-division area D coursework;

EO3 Explain how human, social, political, and economic institutions and individual behavior are inextricably interwoven;

EO4 Examine issues in their contemporary as well as historical settings and in a variety of cultural contexts;

EO5 Examine how relationships between two or more areas of study inform our perspectives.
Upper-Division D Criteria

The course proposal and expanded course outline for courses in upper-division D must clearly indicate how the course meets all of the following criteria:

CR1 Enrollment prerequisites list completion of Areas A1 Oral Communication, A2 Written Communication, and A3 Critical Thinking, and B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning as pursuant to EO1100 Revised (section 2.2.3) and a lower-division D course; some courses will require additional pre-requisites as course content dictates;

CR2 Apply knowledge acquired in lower-division Area D courses to the advanced study of self and society;

CR3 Include relevant principles, methodologies, value systems and ethics employed in social scientific inquiry;

CR4 Examine the impact of social, economic, political, legal, and/or commercial institutions on individuals, societies in the U.S. and/or international contexts, including inequities in treatment of diverse and/or underrepresented groups;

CR5 Meet all other criteria for GE writing-intensive courses (GE Writing Intensive Requirements).

Lifelong Learning and Self Development (4 units)

Area E

This requirement is designed to equip students for lifelong learning and self-development as integrated physiological, psychological, and social beings. Courses in this area focus on topics such as student success strategies, human behavior, sexuality, nutrition, physical and mental health, stress management, information literacy, social relationships and relationships with the environment, as well as implications of death and dying or avenues for lifelong learning. Physical activity may be included, if it is an integral part of the study elements described herein. Courses in this area shall focus on the development of skills, abilities and dispositions. Courses in Area E shall be four units of lower-division foundational course work.

---

2 By “diverse” we intend the definition of diversity found in the Cal Poly Statement on Diversity and Inclusivity (https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1807&context=senateresolutions). By “underrepresented groups” is intended groups who are currently underrepresented and historically marginalized groups.
**E Educational Objectives**

Upon completion of a qualifying Area E course, students should be able to meet five or more of the following:

EO1 Explain the importance of maintaining physical, social, and mental health;

EO2 Describe the self as an integrated physiological, psychological, and social being;

EO3 Recognize themselves as individuals undergoing a particular stage of human development;

EO4 Practice appropriate social skills to enhance learning and develop positive relationships with others who have identities and experiences different from their own;

EO5 Develop a lifelong commitment to practices for personal growth, health, well-being, and societal responsibility;

EO6 Describe the commonalities and differences among people across the lifespan in social or cultural contexts;

EO7 Evaluate how well-being is affected by social systems and how they can facilitate their personal development.

EO8 Critically evaluate information sources and merit of claims on the basis of methods and empirical evidence;

**E Criteria**

The course proposal and expanded outline for lower-division Area E courses must clearly indicate how they meet all of these criteria:

CR1 Introduce the knowledge, skills and attitudes to engage in learning and personal development practices;

CR2 Examine the interrelation of physiological, psychological, and socio-cultural factors on personal development across the lifespan;

CR3 Illustrate the physiological, socio-cultural, and psychological influences on the well-being of individuals and groups;

CR4 Examine the interaction of social institutions, culture, and environment with individual behavior;

CR5 Explore the importance of active engagement by individuals in their communities for the betterment of personal and public life;
CR6 Apply theories and methods to examine the self in various contexts and assess the advantages and disadvantages of these approaches;

CR7 Focus on lifelong learning and/or student success strategies (but not emphasize the logistics of progressing through a degree program);

CR8 Require disciplinary appropriate writing assignments that comprise at least 10% of overall course grade.
# Template for General Education 2020

## Standard GE Template

The standard template includes the following distribution of courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area A: English Language Communication and Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area B: Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Life Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Laboratory Activity in B1 or B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area B</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area C: Arts and Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-division courses in Area C must come from three different prefixes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages other than English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Division C Elective – <em>Select a course from either C1 or C2</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area C</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area D: Social Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 American Institutions (Title 5, Section 40404 Requirement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Lower-Division D – <em>Select courses from two different prefixes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area D</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area E: Lifelong Learning and Self-Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Division E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in Area E</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Electives in Area B, C, and D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GE Electives – <em>Select courses from two different areas; may be either lower- or upper-division levels.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units in GE Electives</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total Units in General Education Program</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# GE Template for High-Unit Programs

The template includes the following distribution of courses for qualifying high-unit programs:

## Area A: English Language Communication and Critical Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>Oral Communication</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Units in Area A: 12

## Area B: Scientific Inquiry and Quantitative Reasoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1</th>
<th>Physical Science</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Life Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Laboratory Activity</td>
<td>in B1 or B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area B Electives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Units in Area B: 28

## Area C: Arts and Humanities

*Lower-division courses in Area C must come from three different prefixes.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1</th>
<th>Arts: Arts, Cinema, Dance, Music, Theater</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Humanities: Literature, Philosophy, Languages other than English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Division C Elective – <em>Select a course from either C1 or C2</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Division C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Units in Area C: 16

## Area D: Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D1</th>
<th>American Institutions (Title 5, Section 40404 Requirement)</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Lower-Division D</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area D Elective – <em>Select either an additional lower-division D2 or an upper-division D course</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Units in Area D: 12

## Area E: Lifelong Learning and Self-Development

| Lower-Division E | 4 |

Total Units in Area E: 4

**Total Units in General Education Program**: 72
High-Unit Programs

Consistent with EO 1100-R (2.2.5), Cal Poly recognizes the need to offer consideration to high-unit major degree programs. Cal Poly’s definition of a high-unit program in the GE template included herein is equivalent to our definition of “engineering programs” from the prior GE template: all programs within the College of Engineering along with the other ABET accredited programs of ARCE and BRAE. Only these programs will be considered high-unit major degree programs.

Writing Component

All General Education courses must have an appropriate writing component. In achieving this objective, writing in most courses should be viewed primarily as a tool of learning (rather than a goal in itself as in a composition course), and faculty should determine the appropriate ways to integrate writing into coursework. The writing component may take different forms according to the subject matter and the purpose of a course. Outside of the GE areas specified below, at least 10% of the grade in all GE courses must be based on appropriate written work (e.g., lab reports, math proofs, essay questions, word problems, exam questions).

GE areas A2, A3, Upper-Division C, and Upper-Division D are designated as Writing Intensive. All courses in these areas must include a minimum of 3,000 words of writing and base 50% or more of a student’s grade on written work. GE area C2 is also designated as Writing Intensive, but all courses in this area must include a minimum of 2,000 words of writing and base 50% or more of a student’s grade on written work. All Writing Intensive courses must include process-oriented writing instruction in which faculty provide ongoing feedback to students to help them grasp the effectiveness of their writing in various disciplinary contexts. The kind and amount of writing must be a factor in determining class sizes.
RESOLUTION ON UNIVERSITY FACULTY PERSONNEL POLICIES
SUBCHAPTER 6.3: POST-TENURE FACULTY EVALUATION PATTERN

Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution revises academic personnel policies contained in University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) 6.3, which was established by AS-874-19.¹

WHEREAS, AS-687-09 established University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA) as Cal Poly's governing document concern faculty evaluation; and

WHEREAS, UFPA VI.B.1.a.(2) requires associate professors and associate librarians to undergo a periodic post-tenure evaluation in their third year at rank; and

WHEREAS, Policies on post-tenure faculty evaluation from UFPA are now contained in University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) chapter 6.3; and

WHEREAS, University policy requiring a third-year associate professor/librarian post-tenure evaluation has long been widely ignored around campus; and

WHEREAS, Consultation with colleges and the library reveals that they prefer the choice of whether or not to implement a third-year associate professor/librarian post-tenure evaluation to be determined at the college level; therefore be it

RESOLVED: The policy included in the report “Proposed Revision of University Faculty Personnel Policies UFPP subchapter 6.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern” replace the policies currently in UFPP 6.3, and be it further
RESOLVED: Colleges and the Library revise chapter 6 of their personnel policy documents by Fall 2020 to reflect whether or not they implement the third-year associate professor/librarian post-tenure evaluation.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: [Sometime in 2020]

\[1\] (1) Describe how this resolution impacts existing policy on educational matters that affect the faculty. Examples include curricula, academic personnel policies, and academic standards.
(2) Indicate if this resolution supersedes or rescinds current resolutions.
(3) If there is no impact on existing policy, please indicate NONE.
Proposed Revision of University Faculty Personnel Policies  
UFPP subchapter 6.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

The Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) is a standing Senate committee with representation from each college, the library and professional consultative services, Academic Affairs, and a student representative. FAC employs a streamlined process for Academic Senate approval of personnel policies which specifies the nature of consultation with faculty affected by proposed changes and provides a clear accounting of which policy documents have been superseded by the proposed change. FAC has used this process to construct a new University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) document and is now employing the same process to revise or propose new personnel policies to UFPP on an as-needed basis.

In creating UFPP FAC has adopted a guiding principle that, as far as possible, the migration of existing personnel policies from the former governing personnel policies document, University Faculty Personnel Actions (UFPA), into UFPP shall not change those policies as they are in UFPA, but instead just reformulate them into the new style and structure of UFPP. Once the policies previously in UFPA are in place in UFPP, FAC may then visit them for subsequent revision in the form of presenting to the Academic Senate revisions to chapters and sections of UFPP.

In AY 2018-2019 the Academic Senate moved policies concerning the multi-year patterns of faculty evaluations from UFPA into chapter 6 of UFPP. One policy from UFPA requires associate professors undergo a periodic evaluation in their third-year post-tenure. This policy, though it has been established by Academic Senate resolution AS-687-09, has been widely ignored. When the Senate considered UFPP chapter 6 the presence of this policy and the widespread disregard of it initiated some discussion about whether or not to preserve this policy. In light of the widespread disregard for this policy, and in light of the value of this policy in those few quarters on campus that follow it, our interim Provost, Mary Pedersen, asked that in AY 2019-20 the Senate consider whether to keep this policy and require conformity across campus, or revise the policy to reflect the current practices around campus by rendering this review optional.

FAC has consulted with the colleges and the library on this matter and now proposes a revision to our policies to preserve existing practice. The upshot of this consultation is that the colleges that conform with this policy want to preserve it and those which have not conformed do not want to implement it. In short, colleges want the option to decide at their level whether or not to require a third-year associate professor periodic review and not have such a review be required at the university level. FAC agree that rendering this review optional is a good policy.

Summary of subchapter 6.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

The policy requiring a third-year associate professor periodic evaluation is stated in UFPP:

6.3.1 A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation shall be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2020
Proposed Revision of University Faculty Personnel Policies
UFPP subchapter 6.3 Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

This policy is a restated version of the original policy at UFPA VI.B.1.a.(2) established by the Academic Senate in resolution AS-687-09 that created UFPA as the governing faculty personnel policy document at Cal Poly:

A periodic evaluation is conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor, Associate Librarian, or SSP-AR II in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.

The proposed revision to subchapter 6.3 of UFPP replaces “shall” with “may” in the policy in question, and adds a requirement that if any college or the library or a department decides to require such a periodic evaluation, that this requirement be stated in their personnel policies. Rendering this policy optional at the college level warrants moving it to a place later in that subchapter, below the general allowance of ad hoc post-tenure evaluations off the normal five-year calendar. And so the sections of this subchapter are rearranged. We’ve also implemented one editorial change, replacing “reviews” for “evaluations” in 6.3.1.

Impact on Existing Policy

UFPP subchapter 6.3 is current Cal Poly policy as part of UFPP Chapter 6 established by AS-874-19. These policies about third-year associate professor/librarian evaluation are from UFPA, established by AS-687-09. Enforcing this policy would change practices in most colleges and the library which have not adhered to this policy.

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) requires tenured faculty to be evaluated at intervals of no greater than five years (CBA 15.35). Timelines for periodic evaluations are determined by faculty units and approved by the President (CBA 15.4). Nothing in the CBA prohibits post-tenure evaluation cycles of less than five years, so long as the timeline is established as a matter of policy.

If the Senate rejects this revision to UFPP 6.3, then the existing policy requiring a third-year associate professor/library evaluation would be tacitly reaffirmed and Academic Personnel would assist the colleges and library in implementing the existing policy.

If the Senate accepts the proposed revision to UFPP 6.3, then the current and long-standing practices at the colleges and library would now conform with university policy.

Implementation

If the Senate rejects the revision to this policy, the third-year associate professor evaluation remains in Cal Poly policy. Implementation of the policy in college and library faculty evaluation calendars would start AY 2020-2021.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Winter 2020
If the Senate revises this policy to render the third-year associate professor evaluation optional, then practices in the colleges and library could continue as they have, though any college or the library may need to revise their policy documents effective the following academic year to reflect their practices in relation to university policy.

What follows is text of the proposed revision of UFPP 6.3. The first version presents the proposed new policy and the second version reveals the revision with markup formatting with existing policy language in black text, moved but otherwise preserved policy in green text with double-strikeout and double-underlining, and revisions to policy text are noted in red with strikeouts for deletions and underlining for new policy text ...
6.3. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

6.3.1. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall be conducted at least once every five years after promotion or appointment to their respective academic rank. Performance evaluations for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic evaluations.

6.3.2. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be conducted by request of the faculty member, the department chair/head, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

6.3.3. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation may be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review. Colleges and other faculty units requiring this evaluation shall include that requirement in their personnel policies documents.

6.3.4. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo a periodic evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator (CBA 15.35).

6.3.5. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation.
6.4.6.3. Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

6.4.1.1.1. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation shall be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review.

6.4.2.6.3.1. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall be conducted at least once every five years after promotion or appointment to their respective academic rank. Performance reviews for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic evaluations.

6.4.3.6.3.2. More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be conducted by request of the faculty member, the department chair/head, or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

6.3.3. A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation shall, may be conducted during the third year in which a tenured faculty employee has served in the academic rank of Associate Professor or Associate Librarian. The purpose of the evaluation is formative and intended to assist and guide the Associate Professor or Associate Librarian in their preparation for subsequent promotion review. Colleges and other faculty units requiring this evaluation shall include that requirement in their personnel policies documents.

6.4.4.6.3.4. Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo a periodic evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator (CBA 15.35).

6.4.5.6.3.5. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation.
IN SUPPORT OF RESOLUTION AS-3403-19/AA: RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION OF A CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU) ETHNIC STUDIES REQUIREMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC SENATE OF THE CSU

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate at Cal Poly is committed to the principle of shared governance and the primacy of the faculty in determining curriculum in the CSU; and

WHEREAS, By virtue of its United States Cultural Pluralism (USCP) requirement, Cal Poly’s curriculum currently includes a class emphasizing the history and challenges of marginalized groups; and

WHEREAS, This feature of Cal Poly’s curriculum is congruent with Resolution AS-3403-19/AA: Recommended Implementation of a California State University (CSU) Ethnic Studies Requirement from the Academic Senate of the CSU; and

WHEREAS, Following best practices for student learning, AS-3403-19/AA expands Cal Poly’s current USCP requirement to include an upper-division requirement in which students would reflect on their lower-division USCP experience; and

WHEREAS, AS-3403-19/AA comes from the duly elected faculty representatives across the CSU who are charged with developing and implementing curricular requirements; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Cal Poly Academic Senate endorse ASCSU Resolution AS-3403-19/AA, and be it further

RESOLVED: That Cal Poly develop a mechanism for departments to incorporate reflection on issues of diversity in their upper-division curriculum requirements, and be it further

RESOLVED: That by its endorsement of AS-3403-19/AA, the Cal Poly Academic Senate opposes the imposition of curriculum on the CSU and its individual
campuses that originates outside the statewide or campus senates, and be
it further

RESOLVED: That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to:

Dr. Catherine Nelson, ASCSU Chair
Dr. Jeffrey Armstrong, Cal Poly President
Dr. Mary Pedersen, Cal Poly Interim Provost
CSU Campus Senate Chairs
Members of the California State Senate
Members of the California State Assembly
Governor Gavin Newsom.

Proposed by: Steve Rein, Academic Senate Executive Committee
Date: February 24, 2020
RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION OF A CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CSU) ETHNIC STUDIES REQUIREMENT

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) adopt the document titled “Ethnic Studies in the CSU” (Attached); and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU call on the CSU to implement these requirements no later than the 2023-24 academic year; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recognize that the process by which these requirements were developed, following Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA), was based on appropriate faculty input and other constituency outreach; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU is grateful for the consultative role of the representatives from the CSU Council on Ethnic Studies; and be it further,

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU endorse a requirement that CSU campus approval and review processes explicitly include evaluation by ethnic studies faculty and subject matter experts, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU endorse the underlying values inherent in the recommendation for an ethnic studies requirement, namely:

a. Student success;
b. A focus on learning outcomes;
c. A recognition of CSU campus autonomy in the definition of student-success and implementation of the ethnic studies curriculum; and
d. The desirability of scaffolding lower and upper division experiences in achieving ethnic studies outcomes

; and be it further,

---

1 Some CSU and California Community College campuses already have ethnic studies or diversity requirements. Individual campuses may adopt local graduation requirements prior to implementation of the system requirement. The system implementation date as a GE requirement has to be far enough out to allow appropriate curriculum development processes.
**RESOLVED:** That this resolution be distributed to the CSU Chancellor, Timothy P. White, CSU Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs Loren Blanchard, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California State Student Association (CSSA), California State Assemblymember Dr. Shirley Weber, California State Senator Dr. Richard Pan, CSU Council on Ethnic Studies, CSU-Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA), California Faculty Association (CFA), and the CSU Board of Trustees.

**RATIONALE:** This resolution is in support of, and defines the parameters for, a CSU ethnic studies requirement (resolved #1).

The proposed timeline (resolved #2), while aggressive, allows the CSU campuses time for curricular revision (Fall 2020 guidance on implementation, Fall 2021 pilot work, Fall 2022 catalog submissions for the 2023/24 catalog year) while also explicitly permitting campuses with preexisting or new campus-specific ethnic studies requirements (for which SB 1440 / Student Transfer Achievement Reform [STAR] Act holds transfer students exempt) to have those in advance of full implementation within CSU General Education (GE) which is required of all students.

The resolution follows up on earlier requests for campus feedback regarding an ethnic studies requirement component for baccalaureate level graduates of the CSU (AS-3397-19/AA “Towards Implementation of an Ethnic Studies System Requirement”). As a reference document, we note that AS-3397-19/AA includes a listing of prior suggestions and actions related to implementation of the proposed ethnic studies requirements. The consultative process (resolved #3, #4) allowed the final recommendation to be grounded in campus practice, disciplinary expertise, and iterative improvement (including being responsive to changes between this first [November, 2019] and the second reading [January, 2020]). Similarly, the explicitness of the recommendation that campus approval and review processes include disciplinary expertise (resolved #4) originate from consultative input.

The structure of the proposed requirements is two-fold. First, there are five student learning outcomes. The first four outcomes cover some of the core elements of Ethnic Studies as a discipline while the fifth ensures that the student “act to engage” appropriate content in a participatory fashion. Second, the implementation guidelines produce a minimal structure on how these outcomes are to be achieved. The primary (and initial) exposure to the ethnic studies
requirement is at the lower-division. This exposure is defined as an overlay to be included as part of lower-division GE (with an allowance for non-GE coursework to be able to be used by a campus to meet the ethnic studies requirement). This achieves two compatible goals – the first is to ensure that all students (both CSU freshmen and California Community Colleges [CCC] transfer students, including those with 1440-compliant transfer degrees) achieve ethnic studies competencies. The second is to ensure that unit requirements within GE are not increased. The implementation structure also requires a secondary exposure to ethnic studies at the upper-division. The upper division exposure (reflection on ethnic studies) ensures a spread of ethnic studies exposure beyond a “one and done” style requirement.

The ethnic studies requirement is deliberately described as “outcomes” rather than “units” (resolved 6) in order to maximally protect campus autonomy – as an overlay across (and potentially beyond) general education coursework the requirement encourages direct assessment of achievement without the “unit distribution” framework currently incorporated in GE; The structure does not preclude a campus from adopting a “course-based” 3-unit framework but leaves that implementation for campus self-determination. Due to the unique structure of this outcomes-based requirement it is especially important that campuses act to ensure the integrity of the requirement in review and assessment processes (resolved 5)

Approved – January 23-24, 2020
Ethnic studies is the interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity. The cultures, lived conditions, and histories of Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, Latina/o Americans, and other racialized groups ground and center its scholarship, teaching, and learning. Ethnic studies involves social engagement (service and struggle), social change, and social justice—generating cooperative and collaborative initiatives between campus and community.

Ethnic studies is the intellectual and institutional space for the historically unstudied, understudied, marginalized, and misrepresented peoples of color. Ethnic studies supports both the study of marginalized populations and the affective acknowledgment of identity. The value of ethnic studies is that it gives voice to marginalized groups and produces systems of knowledge that equitably support a democratic and multicultural society.

Ethnic studies creates a more welcoming environment for all students by providing courses and/or experiences that play an important role in building an inclusive democracy. Research confirms that students of color and white students both benefit, academically and socially, from exposure to ethnic studies.

**Ethnic Studies Requirement: Student Learning Outcomes**

Each campus shall include and address the following ethnic studies student learning outcomes in the General Education curriculum. Upon completing their ethnic studies requirement, students will be able to:

1. analyze and articulate core concepts of ethnic studies, including but not limited to race and ethnicity, racialization, equity, ethno-centrism, Eurocentrism, and white supremacy;

2. apply theory to describe critical events in the histories, cultures, and intellectual traditions of communities of color with a particular emphasis on agency and self-affirmation;
3. describe the intersection of race and ethnicity with other forms of difference affected by hierarchy and oppression, such as class, gender, sexuality, religion, spirituality, national origin, immigration status, ability, and/or age;

4. describe how resistance, social justice, and liberation as experienced by communities of color are relevant to current issues (communal, national, and international); and

5. demonstrate active engagement with issues of race and ethnicity to build diverse, just, and equitable communities beyond the classroom.

**ETHNIC STUDIES REQUIREMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

1. The primary ethnic studies requirement is a minimum 3 semester unit course or course overlay\(^2\) as part of lower division GE (ethnic studies outcomes 1-5 as a requirement of lower division GE). This primary requirement will start in the 2023-24 academic year.

2. The secondary ethnic studies requirement is a reflective element (reinforcing any two of ethnic studies outcomes 2-5) in the upper-division.\(^3\) This secondary requirement will start in the 2027-28 academic year.

3. All ethnic studies approved equivalencies must meet the ethnic studies outcomes; i.e., the ethnic studies requirement could be met or partially met with existing campus requirements and/or courses that were developed to meet local requirements.

4. Campuses may determine additional ethnic studies requirements (outcomes or implementation) beyond the minimal list provided.

5. Campuses may choose to have a cultural diversity requirement in addition to the ethnic studies requirement.

6. Campuses may choose to implement these requirements prior to the implementation dates as campus specific graduation requirements.

\(^2\) It is anticipated that most campuses will implement this lower division requirement as a 3 semester-unit course that overlays with another GE area. Respect for campus autonomy and normal curricular processes allows variation of implementation, such as an integrated sequenced set of courses that meet the learning outcomes.

\(^3\) This secondary requirement is not a 3 semester unit course; rather, the requirement could be integrated into a major or non-major course. Campuses will have discretion how to implement this upper-division requirement.
WHEREAS, Cal Poly has a policy on the Discontinuation of Academic Programs, which requires a potentially lengthy review by two separate groups, one representing students, staff, and faculty that are involved in the program, and the other representing students, staff, and faculty that are not involved in the program; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly’s College of Liberal Arts used to offer an M.S. in Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging; and

WHEREAS, After offering a certificate program for 2 years and graduating a single Master’s class, it was determined that there was insufficient enrollment to make the program self-support. The program stopped accepting students in 2016; and

WHEREAS, Admission to the M.S. in Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging degree program has been suspended for the past three years; and

WHEREAS, There are no students currently active in the program; and

WHEREAS, The Chair of the Graphic Communications department has requested that the M.S. in Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging program be discontinued, and the program faculty supports it discontinuation; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the M.S. in Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging program be discontinued as of AY 2020-21, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the discontinuance of the aforementioned program does not establish any criteria for the discontinuation of any other academic program.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and Academic Programs and Planning
Date: February 18, 2020
To: President Jeffrey Armstrong, Ph.D.

From: Colleen Twomey, Chair, Graphic Communication

Subject: Discontinuing the MS in Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging in Graphic Communication

Date: December 5, 2019

CC: Bruno Giberti, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Planning
    Dustin Stegner, Academic Senate Chair
    Amy Robbins, Academic Programs & Planning
    Dina Vees, GrC Curriculum Chair

In 2014 the Graphic Communication Department launched a Master’s Degree in Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging (PEFI), which was comprised of a certificate program (first year, all online), followed by an in-residence completion for the second year. After offering the certificate program for 2 years and graduating a single Master’s class, it was determined that there was insufficient enrollment to make the program self-support. The program stopped accepting students in 2016.

The GrC faculty met fall in 2019 to discuss curriculum strategy for the short and long term, and unanimously voted to discontinue the MS in Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging. Our undergraduate Bachelor of Science includes courses in Printed Electronics, and faculty continue to publish research in this area to stay on top of their field.

As a result, I hereby formally request that the Master’s Degree in Printed Electronics and Functional Imaging be discontinued.

Sincerely,

Colleen L. Twomey
Associate Professor and Chair
Graphic Communication Department
Impact on Existing Policy: This resolution impacts AS-592-03/IC “Resolution on Class Attendance,” which includes CAM 485.2. This resolution also impacts the policy as it is communicated on the Academic Programs and Planning website, where these policies are posted, as well as the Cal Poly catalog.

WHEREAS, The policy on Class Attendance has not been reviewed since the passage of AS-592-03/IC in March 2003; and

WHEREAS, This section outlines the excusable reasons for allowing students to make up missed work; and

WHEREAS, The last Class Attendance policy was instituted with the understanding that the policy would continue to be reviewed and updated to reflect additional appropriate excusable reasons for missing class and allowing students to make up missed work; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly values an inclusive culture that is supportive of students striving to balance their obligations as caregivers while meeting expectations for course requirements; and

WHEREAS, The current policy omits any mention of students with dependents, who are parents, guardians, or caregivers at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional school level; and

WHEREAS, Overall, the proposed policy provides clarifying language that is not stated in the current policy. As presently published, the Class Attendance policy reads as follows:

It is strongly urged that instructors accept the following “excusable” reasons for allowing students to make up missed work:

A. Illness with a doctor’s statement
B. Serious illness or death of close relatives

C. Active participation in university events (an instructor may require a statement from the adviser involved certifying that the student was actively participating in a recognized university event)

D. Field trips

E. Religious holidays

F. Selective service and military reasons

G. NCAA athletic competitions

H. Instructionally Related Activities (IRA)/competition

I. Jury duty or any other legally required court appearances

J. Job or internship interviews;

Therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the wording in Class Attendance policy be changed as follows:

It is strongly urged that instructors accept the following “excusable” reasons for allowing students to make up missed work:

And, be it further

RESOLVED: That the following clarifying language be added to the policy as excusable reasons for making up missed class work:

B. Injury, illness, death, or any extenuating circumstances of close relatives (to include but not limited to natural, adopted, and/or in-law children, parents, legal guardian, siblings, grandparents, grandchildren as well as spouse or partner)

Extemporaneous circumstances can be defined as serious and exceptional factors outside the student’s control which adversely affected the student’s attendance during class time.

Proposed by: Dr. Jerusha Greenwood, Ashlee Hernandez, Alan Faz, Tess Loarie, Kylie Clark
Date: February 26, 2020
Update to the Class Attendance Policy to Include Students with Dependents

In the fall of 2019, Student Affairs launched a needs assessment as part of the Students with Dependents Initiative. A survey was developed and distributed to students who identified having minor dependents (via FAFSA), patrons of the Orfalea Family & ASI Children’s Center, the Educational Opportunity Program, TRIO Achievers, the Veterans Success Center, and Cal Poly Scholars. They identified 109 incoming students for Fall 2019 with minor dependents.

The Resolution to Update the Cal Poly Attendance Policy to Include Students with Dependents addresses a specific need identified by the assessment: the clarification of the language in the course attendance policy to include students with dependents.

The proposed resolution charges the Academic Senate Instruction Committee to revise the excused absence language in the Campus Administrative Policy/Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) Section 485.2 to be more inclusive of nontraditional students who are responsible for the care of dependents. A dependent, in the revised language, will include parent, legal guardian, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, spouse or partner, as well as natural, adopted, and/or in-law children.

Updating the language surrounding excused absences will provide the following opportunities for Cal Poly:

- Encourage faculty to support students with dependents to succeed in college by excusing absences and permitting them to make up missed work. Doing so facilitates achievement of the GI 2025 graduation rate goals;
- Aid movement toward the Cal Poly Diversity and Inclusion Initiative to recruit and maintain a diverse student body;
- Align Cal Poly better with the full scope of Title IX and California AB 809, which address protections of pregnant students and students with dependents; and
- Align Cal Poly with California AB 2289, a policy regarding public schools, that states that students with dependents shall be excused from school due to an illness or medical appointment with their child, including absences to care for a sick child.

---

1 Several other needs were identified as a result of the assessment. For example, access to priority registration to reduce complications related to scheduling conflicts between parental responsibilities and Cal Poly classes and coursework; the development of resource guides with campus and community resources; the availability of more diaper/baby changing stations throughout campus, and family friendly study areas were all identified.
3 “Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives – Diversity & Inclusion: Cal Poly.” Diversity & Inclusion | Cal Poly, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, 2018, Online. diversity.calpoly.edu/initiatives/.
4 United States. California State Assembly. “An act to amend Section 66281.7 of, and to add Section 66061 to, the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.” AB 809. Print.
5 United States. California State Assembly. “An act to amend Section 66281.7 of, and to add Section 66061 to, the Education Code.” AB 2289. Print.
Current language in CAP/CAM Section 485.2 states that “it is strongly urged that instructors accept the following ‘excusable’ reasons for allowing students to make up missed work:

- Illness with a doctor’s statement
- Serious illness or death of close relatives

At present, the policy omits mention of students with dependents who require care but are not seriously ill. This creates complications for students who are responsible for the care, for example, of infant/small children running a fever high enough to keep them out of daycare but not serious enough to require a visit to a primary care physician or urgent care facility. According to the Orfalea Family/ASI Childcare Center, children who have experienced a fever above 100F, stomach ache, sneezing with a runny nose are not permitted to attend the program until their symptoms have been absent for at least 24 hours. When such symptoms appear suddenly (which is common with the onset of illness) Cal Poly students often experience difficulty procuring alternative care for their children, or are unable to afford that alternative care. Similarly, students with dependents who are not minors but have immediate requirements for care often find themselves unable to choose between their dependents and attending lectures, activities, or laboratories.

Other Universities in the United States have adapted their attendance policies to be more inclusive of non-traditional students:

**CSU Fresno**

Unplanned student absences should be authorized when the student has a short-term serious and compelling medical condition or when a death or serious illness in the immediate family (i.e., parent, spouse, sibling or child) prevents attending class.

**CSU Long Beach**

Death, injury, or serious illness of an immediate family member. An immediate family member is defined as a close relative, or a person residing in the immediate household of the student.

Additionally, Mississippi State University, Marshall University, and Texas A & M, are a few examples of Universities that have language that use language inclusive of dependents or immediate family.

---

6 Campus Administrative Manual.” Academic Senate, 1991, academic senate.calpoly.edu/cam
9 “Attendance.” Texas A & M University Student Rules, Rule 7: Attendance, 2019, Online. student-rules.tamu.edu/rule07/
RESOLUTION TO UPDATE THE CLASS ATTENDANCE POLICY TO INCLUDE STUDENTS WITH DEPENDENTS

WHEREAS: The ASI Board of Directors serves as the official voice of students at California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly), San Luis Obispo; and

WHEREAS: Current Cal Poly Class Attendance Policy1 omits mention of students with dependents, who are parents, guardians, or caregivers at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional school level2; and

WHEREAS: The United States Government Accountability Office reveals there are nearly four million undergraduate students who are raising children, representing 22 percent of all students attending United States colleges3; and

WHEREAS: California Education Code section 48213 stipulates that children with obvious signs of illness are not accepted into a childcare facility and are excluded from care for a minimum of 24 hours4; and

WHEREAS: At Cal Poly, the Orfalea Family & ASI Children’s Center Policy Handbook5 states teachers assess each child’s wellbeing upon arrival and send sick children home6, creating unintended consequences for students with dependents who rely on child care providers in order to attend class; and

WHEREAS: In California policy regarding K-12 public schools, Assembly Bill (AB) 22897 states a student with dependent shall be excused from school due to an illness or medical appointment of their child, including absences to care for a sick child; and

WHEREAS: Other institutions such as Mississippi State University have adopted explicit excused absence policies for students with dependents, excusing absences for issues regarding a student’s immediate family members including a: parent, legal guardian, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, spouse or partner, as well as natural, adopted and/or in-law children8; and

---

1 "Campus Administrative Manual.” Academic Senate, 1991, academicsenate.calpoly.edu/cam
2 California Student Aid Commission. Students with Dependent Children (SWD) FAQs. Csac.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/swd_frequently_asked_questions.pdf
7 United States. California State Assembly. “An act to amend Section 66281.7 of, and to add Section 66061 to, the Education Code.” AB 2289. Print.
WHEREAS: In compliance with Title IX, the California State Legislature passed AB 809 in September 2019, requiring higher education institutions to post the notification of protections for pregnant students and students with dependents on their website, emphasizing the rights of students with dependents; and

WHEREAS: Despite evidence that nationally, students with dependents have higher grade point averages than their traditional peers, only about eight percent of students with dependents in college will obtain an associate’s or bachelor’s degree within six years; and

WHEREAS: While the California State University system has implemented the Graduation Initiative 2025 in an effort to increase graduation rates for all CSU students by eliminating opportunity and achievement gaps, current graduation rates suggest that students with dependents require additional support to succeed in college; and

WHEREAS: Cal Poly’s Diversity and Inclusion Initiative states the university will recruit and maintain a diverse student body; and

WHEREAS: Nationally, students with dependents constitute one-third of first-generation college students, and nearly 37% of black students are students with dependents; hence, this issue dramatically impacts Cal Poly’s Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives, yet no policy exists to bridge this achievement gap.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: The ASI Board of Directors hereby urges the Cal Poly Academic Senate to revise the wording as it pertains to the class attendance policy to include the following:

Class Attendance

It is strongly urged that instructors accept the following “excusable” reasons for allowing students to make up missed work while considering implementation shall be equitable for all qualifying students:

A. Illness with a doctor’s statement
B. Serious illness, death, or any extenuating circumstances of close relatives (including but not limited to parents, legal guardian, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, spouse or partner, as well as natural, adopted, and/or in-law children)

---

9 Title IX prohibits discrimination based on sex in education programs or activities
10 United States. California State Assembly. “An act to amend Section 66281.7 of, and to add Section 66061 to, the Education Code, relating to public postsecondary education.” AB 809. Print.
13 “Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives – Diversity & Inclusion: Cal Poly.” Diversity & Inclusion | Cal Poly, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, 2018, Online. diversity.calpoly.edu/initiatives/.
FURTHERMORE
BE IT
RESOLVED: This resolution will be sent to University President Jeffrey D. Armstrong, Interim Provost Mary Pedersen, Vice President for Student Affairs Keith Humphrey, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion Jozi De Leon, Academic Senate Chair Dustin Stegner, Dean of Students Kathleen McMahon, College of Engineering Dean Amy Fleisher, College of Architecture and Environmental Design Dean Christine Theodoropoulos, College of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Sciences Dean Andy Thulin, College of Science and Mathematics Dean Dean Wendt, College of Liberal Arts Dean Philip Williams, and Orfalea College of Business Dean Scott Dawson.

Certified as the true and correct copy, in witness thereof, I have set my hand and Seal of the San Luis Obispo Cal Poly Associated Students, Inc. this _____ day of ____________, 2020.

Adopted at the regular meeting of the Board of Directors at San Luis Obispo Cal Poly Associated Students, Inc. this _____ day of ____________, 2020.

Attest: ____________________________
ASI Secretary

Signed: ____________________________
ASI Chair of the Board

Signed: ____________________________
ASI President

Authored By:

Ashlee Hernandez, Masters Candidate, Higher Education Counseling and Student Affairs
Alan Faz, Board of Directors, College of Engineering
Tess Loarie, Board of Directors, College of Engineering
Kylie Clark, Board of Directors, College of Liberal Arts
Dominique Morales, Board of Directors, College of Liberal Arts
February 13, 2020

ASI Student Government
California Polytechnic State University,
San Luis Obispo
Julian A. McPhee University Union
Bldg. 65, Room 202

To the ASI Board of Directors,

As a faculty member, academic senator, and member of the Cal Poly Academic Senate Executive Committee, I am very pleased to provide a letter of support for the Resolution to Update the Class Attendance Policy to Include Students with Dependents (Resolution #20-).

I believe it is the duty of the academic institution to remove structural barriers that prohibit the academic and professional development of students. This includes a close examination and revision of any policy that advises faculty about student attendance in classes, especially when the nature of student life outside of the classroom is considered. Students with dependents – including children, parents, siblings, grandparents, legal guardians, partners – require better accommodation from the university in the form of clearer policy guidance regarding excused absences.

While Academic Programs’ language about excused absences includes “serious illness or death of close relatives,” a clearer statement that supports students with dependents would provide those students an ability to appeal to their instructors for accommodation when they learn cannot attend class due to immediate and/or emergency circumstances. For example, students with dependents enrolled at the Orfalea Family/ASI Children’s Center must retrieve them if they develop a fever or cannot drop them off for care if they do. Childcare on the central coast, particularly if needed at the last minute, is notoriously difficult to find. I can attest to this both as a parent and as an instructor of students with small children.

This resolution will help the university align itself more effectively with its own childcare facility’s policies, as well as with California public school policy and education code. We will better comply with Title IX regarding pregnant students and students with dependents, and help our students achieve their educational and professional goals.

Please support the passage of this resolution.

In community,

Jerusha B. Greenwood
Associate Professor, Experience Industry Management
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Dear ASI Board of Directors,

I am writing in support of the Resolution to Update the Class Attendance Policy to include students with dependents. As a parent of two children, I am constantly faced with the struggle of choosing parenting over school. My education is very important to me but due to limited childcare resources I often have to miss class when my children are sick. One of my children has an incurable brain disease called Moya-Moya. Her condition is monitored by Dr. 's at Stanford Hospital and she often has multiple appointments per month. Due to my daughter’s insurance and the high volume of patients her doctor sees, I do not have the ability to schedule appointments around my school schedule. During the flu season, my children were sick multiple times and were diagnosed with the influenza virus. In order to protect other children from getting sick, my children needed to stay home from school. Since childcare providers cannot risk getting other children or themselves sick as a parent I had to miss class to stay home to take care of them. When I have to miss class for my children's medical needs or illnesses it is currently considered unexcused by the school. This causes a large barrier amongst many students who have dependents. Often times this barrier can cause students to put their education on hold.

My daughter was diagnosed in the beginning of 2019 with an incurable disease and it was my first year at Cal Poly. My whole life changed and my daughters medical needs became my first priority. I often thought about withdrawing from my classes and putting my education on hold because I knew I was not always going to be able to attend my classes due to my daughter's new diagnosis. I think it is very important that the school consider the students who have children and allow us to have excused absences when we need to miss class due to the needs of our children. Many of us are trying to achieve lifelong goals and we need to feel supported by the school when it comes to pursuing our education.

Sincerely,

Gabriela Perez  
Undergraduate Student
To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing today in support of a resolution advanced by Ashlee Hernandez regarding students with dependents. The resolution asks that explicit language is added to the university class attendance policy in the Cal Poly Catalog and campus administrative policy, which “strongly urges” instructors to accept certain reasons, which are listed in the policy, for missing class. Among those reasons are, for example, religious holidays, illness, or an athletic competition. The policy is clearly nonbinding for faculty, but the explicit language enforces a culture of access and equity for students who must miss class for good reason. I think family is one of the most important reasons to miss class.

I believe in adding unavoidable caregiving responsibilities to what I think is a generous, explicit list of excuses for absence. This would give instructors nonbinding guidance to support our students who are parents or caregivers.

Parenthood is a significant potential student identity. By adding explicit language to the list of possible excuses for absence, I believe faculty would be encouraged toward better inclusion. The CPX initiative has revealed that there are many faculty members such as me who believe strongly in recruiting and retaining a diverse student body. The data presentations of CPX emphasized a number of identities’ perspectives on diversity, equity and inclusion. A few of the CPX discussions since have focused on intersectional identity: being a member of more than one identity concurrently. It is intersection that most strongly relates to the resolution offered by Ms. Hernandez. If we truly seek to increase racial/ethnic diversity in our student body, I remind my colleagues that up to 1/3 of our potential students of color are parents. The likelihood of parenthood among graduate students, and graduate students of color, is even higher. It is more likely that students of minoritized backgrounds are parents, than white students. So, to declare that we welcome a diverse applicant pool without explicitly reassuring a significant portion of that applicant pool, who are parents, that they will be supported at times when they must prioritize children and family, is to effectively reduce the diversity of our potential applicant pool.
We explicitly welcome and recruit athletes. They are listed in the policy already. We list jurors, and students missing for military, field trip, job seeking, or religious reasons. We support their absences and the opportunity to make up missed work, explicitly, by listing those situations. Faculty are “strongly urged” to excuse athletes for their sporting events, but our attendance policy is completely silent on the issue of a child with a fever. We have the opportunity to considerably expand our potential applicant pool’s diversity by explicitly welcoming parents to our student body. We can do this by reassuring them that we value students who are parents, as we already do for athletes, jurors, students who are ill, and others. I am requesting that Ashlee’s proposal be given serious consideration, and that explicit language be added to the excusable reasons list for students to miss class and make up the missed work.

Thank you for your consideration of this important resolution.

Sincerely,

Andrew M. Byrne, PhD, CRC, CCCE
Assistant Professor, School of Education

anbyrne@calpoly.edu
Dear Rob,

As someone who was a parent starting in my college years and as a psychologist with expertise in development across the lifespan, I am writing to express my support for the modifications to the excused absence policy to explicitly mention children and other close relations. Many Cal Poly students have multiple responsibilities that extend to the area of caregiving for children, parents or grandparents, spouses, and other relations. This refinement of the language in the excused absence policy recognizes and affirms the importance of those responsibilities, which I know our students work to balance with their responsibilities towards their studies.

Thank you for consideration,

Debra L. Valencia-Laver, Ph.D. (pronouns: she, her, hers)

Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Professor, Psychology & Child Development
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
PH: 805.756.2359 FAX: 805.756.5748
dlvalenc@calpoly.edu
February 10, 2020

To Members of the Academic Senate,

I am writing to show my enthusiastic support for the student-led resolution to clarify language in the class attendance policy to include students with dependents.

The current attendance policy states excused absences include: Serious illness or death of close relatives.

This proposal would change the language to include the following: “Serious illness, death, or any extenuating circumstances of close relatives (to include but not limited to parents, legal guardian, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, spouse or partner, as well as natural, adopted, and/or in-law children).”

The current CalPoly attendance policy omits any mention of students with caregiving duties, thus impacting their ability to both care for their sick child and remain in good academic standing. In other words, student parents who miss class to care for their ill dependents result in a “unexcused” absence. Because much of caretaking responsibilities are gendered, the current version of the attendance policy impacts student mothers disproportionally, thereby hindering our institutional diversity and inclusion goals. This work has been led by one of my mentees Ashlee Hernandez, a former transfer student and first generation CalPoly alumna and student parent, and currently enrolled in the Master’s degree program in the School of Education and whose research and advocacy work is funded by the Baker Koob Endowment.

The goal of this resolution is to create a policy aimed toward closing equity gaps for students with dependents, but it also creates visibility for students who feel invisible on this campus. The support for this policy is part of a larger body of both existing and proposed work addressing diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) issues highlighted in the CPX report with goals of increasing retention and on time graduation for this population of students.

I believe that a vote for this policy will help CalPoly move closer toward meeting CSU’s Graduation Initiative 2025—by eliminating equity gaps in degree completion for this student population.

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me at tcheuk@calpoly.edu and #805-756-6775 (office).

Sincerely,

Dr. Tina Cheuk
Assistant Professor, School of Education, CSM
Diversity Cluster Hire (2019)

---

1 Research work is funded through Office of University Diversity & Inclusion (BEACoN Research) and Baker Koob Endowment.

2 A Strategic Initiative proposal was submitted by Dr. Tina Cheuk and Dr. Joni Roberts (Kinesiology) with the support of Amy Gode (Assistant Director, Disability Resource Center), Genie Kim (Director of Wellbeing, Campus Health and Wellbeing), Suzanne Phelan (CSM/Kinesiology & Public Health), Charlotte Rinaldi (Retention Specialist, University Advising), and Alison Ventura, (CSM/Kinesiology & Public Health).
The Invisible Work of Students with Dependents

I made a deliberate decision not to share my status as a student parent when I first enrolled at Cal Poly. I was already overwhelmed by navigating this institution as a first-generation, low-income woman of color. I did not need another marker of diversity—another potential source of bias—as a part of my identity.

Yet, during my first quarter, I was forced to expose my identity to my professor when my son was unexpectedly sent home with a fever. When I requested to care for my sick child, the options were untenable. Missing class to care for my sick child was considered an “unexcused” absence, which on that date, meant that I would not be able to make up the in-class assignment that was 25% of my grade. This experience was devastating because it forced me to choose between being a ‘good’ parent and a ‘good’ student—two identities that do not necessarily complement each other in institutions where student parents are made to feel invisible.

We could all do a better job of recognizing that student parents exist across all of the six colleges and in our classrooms. We need inclusive policies that allow student parents to thrive both as a student and a parent. The amount of effort we put into being a student while balancing our caregiving duties is what propels us to do what it takes to succeed. I promise the last thing we want to do is to miss a class—we fought too hard to get here. We want the same opportunity to make up missed classwork when our dependents are sick.

Some of these circumstances are beyond our control. Childcare facilities and public schools are mandated by law to exclude sick children from care for a minimum of 24 hours, creating unintended consequences for students with dependents. For example, if my son becomes suddenly ill, it is difficult to find and afford back-up childcare. Similarly, students who care for their ailing adult family members face similar challenges—torn between caring for their ill-family members or attending class. Student parents should not be penalized for taking care of their family members when they fall ill.

The current class attendance policy omits any mention of students with caregiving duties, thus impacting our ability to both care for their sick dependents and have the opportunity to remain in good academic standing. Our current attendance policy is in direct contrast to other California State Universities like Fresno State and Long Beach, with class attendance policies that support student so that they can care for their family members when they fall ill without the pervasive fear of being punished.

While diversity and inclusion is a core tenet of the values of Cal Poly’s campus, student parents are absent from these conversations. As a result, this population is made to be unseen, inadvertently erasing the narratives of who can occupy and thrive. Institutions reap the benefits when students can bring their authentic selves to school. We all benefit when students feel like they belong and aren’t penalized for their student parent status.

With the support of the Educational Opportunity Program, Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) and Student Affairs, we have offered greater clarity in the language in the class attendance policy to be inclusive of student with caretaking responsibilities. As this resolution moves to the Academic
Senate, I urge faculty members to take into consideration policies that recognize this student population and enact practices that can better include student parents and our diverse personhoods we bring into our learning spaces.