

Minutes

of the Academic Senate Meeting
October 19, 2022

PRESENT: Aragon, Barding, Chase, Davidov-Pardo, Fallah Fini, Forward, Gad, Gekara, Givens, Guerrero, Guthrie, Hanink, Kumar, Lloyd, Monemi, Moore, Myers, Nakhjiri, Nissenson, Osborn, Pacleb, Quinn, Roy, Sharma, Shen, Small, Snyder, Urey, Valentine, Vallejo, Van, Von Glahn, Welke, Yoo

ABSENT: Amamra

GUESTS: A. Baski, J. Brown, N. Chaturvedi, T. Gomez, M. Haghghi, J. Hargis, C. LaMunyon, L. Massa, R. Navarro, M Page, B. Quillian, L. Rotunni, C. Santiago-González, N. Sethia

Chair Von Glahn called the meeting to order and welcomed ASI Senator Ashley Mascarenhas, who was not in attendance.

1. Academic Senate Minutes – September 21, 2022

M/s/p to postpone the September 21, 2022 Academic Senate Meeting minutes.

2. Information Items
a. Chair's Report

Chair Von Glahn commented that all information reports are written except for the Chair's Report and the Provost's Report. This is to ensure that there is enough time to get through all the important items on the agenda today.

Chair Von Glahn stated that the general rules in a debate/discussion, each member has the right to speak twice on the same question on the same day but cannot make a second speech on the same question so long as any member who has not spoken on the question desires the floor. A member who has spoken twice, on a particular question on the same day has exhausted their right to debate that question for that day. To ensure that members have an opportunity to speak, each member will have a 3-minute speaking time limit. He added that there are some contentious items on the agenda and asked all in attendance to be collegial during the debates.

b. President's Report

The President was not in attendance, no report was presented.

c. Provost's Report

The Provost's Report is located on the Academic Senate website at https://www.cpp.edu/senate/documents/packets/2022-23/10.19.22/final_provosts_report_to_academic_senate_2022-10-19.pdf.

Provost Brown commented that she is very happy to have the opportunity to address the Academic Senate. She shared that last week she met with the systemwide provost and Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA) colleagues in San Francisco to talk about the different issues facing higher education. Provost Brown shared a couple slides on the *Future of California and Higher Education*

presented by the Public Policy Institute of California. The conversations centered around who is available in the California population to come to college, whether it is community college, CSU, or UC systems.

The following are key highlights from those conversations:

- California's regions are growing apart economically when you look at per capita income
 - The per capita income of the Inland Empire is equivalent to Alabama (per capital income comparisons (2020))
 - The Los Angeles per capita income is equivalent to Washington
- College pathway by income
 - For middle- and high-income students, 760 out of 1000 will attend any college and 440 out of 1000 will earn a bachelor's degree
 - For low-income students, 541 out of 1000 will attend any college and 203 out of 1000 will earn a bachelor's degree

There will be a Campus Conversation on the budget on Tuesday, October 25, 2022, from 12:00 to 1:00 p.m. This Zoom meeting ID is 853 498 771 39. President Coley, Provost Brown, and Vice President Trinidad will be discussing the CPP budget and its impacts.

Provost Brown mentioned that there have been some challenges with payroll, moving and traveling expenses. She stated that she is aware of the difficulties, and Faculty Affairs has been working with VP Trinidad and payroll to improve communication. Cross divisional units are collaborating on processing all requests in a timely manner.

The Provost commented that on the agenda today is the second reading for the class scheduling rules and it has become clear that there are some department chairs that are doing an excellent job with scheduling and that there are some that may need some assistance and support. Designing a meaningful class schedule considers both faculty and student interest in both online and in-person teaching and learning. This a residential campus and it will remain a residential campus. Scheduling should follow principles that are defined by department chairs, in consultation with their deans. Provost Brown emphasized that student learning outcomes are the most important, and curriculum and modalities should be part of the conversation. But, the experience of the instructor needs to be considered, whether they have experience in online or hybrid modalities. The Provost shared, that at this moment in the semester, it is 76.4% face-to-face and the campus should continue to strive for higher levels of face-to-face classes. The pandemic has introduced online, and hybrid modalities and faculty should not be expected to teach in ways that there is not support for. The Provost's Office is dedicated to providing resources to help chairs with scheduling and faculty with the support they need to teach in different modalities. The Provost encouraged faculty members as the campus explores modalities, today and in the future, to share ideas regarding what type of support is needed. Please contact AVP Massa at lmassa@cpp.edu with your suggestions and ideas.

Provost Brown stated that Cal Poly Pomona is a campus in high demand and because of that the campus has experienced years of steady enrollment growth reaching 25% over its CSU FTES funded target. The 25% overfunded target is not sustainable, so there is intentionality over the next two years. Based on the fall 2022 census, the campus headcount is 27,173 with a total FTES of 23,387. Over the last two years, we have intentionally reduced our enrollment; this year we expect to be approximately 9% over our CSU FTES funded target of 19,653. This will be an on-going conversation this academic year and beyond.

The second Faculty Progress Report submission will be open from October 20 through November 13, 2022. Faculty can submit an early alert for students who may need extra support to successfully complete their course(s). Faculty do not need to submit another report for students who were identified through the first progress report. The Early Alert Team is busy reaching out to identified

students and providing support as needed.

National Transfer Student Week is October 17-21, 2022. ASI and PolyTransfer have partnered to bring a series of events that highlight and celebrate the transfer student population at Cal Poly Pomona.

CPP First-Gen Week is November 7-10, 2022. First-Gen week is a cross campus collaboration that consists of various in person and virtual workshops celebrating what it means to be a first-generation college student. The kickoff celebration is on November 7, from 11:00 am to 4:00 pm at University Park.

d. Vice Chair's Report *

NEW REFERRALS: (3)

AA-007-223 Draft Academic Calendar 2023-24 through 2027-28

AP-005-223 New Self-Support Master of Science in Digital Marketing

EP-002-223 Academic Senate Representation for Part-Time Lecturer Faculty

SENATE REPORTS FORWARDED TO PRESIDENT: (6)

AS-3011-223-AA	Class Scheduling Rules
AS-3012-223-AP	Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, Diversity and Special Education Emphasis Discontinuation
AS-3013-223-AP	Education, M.A. - Special Education Subplan/Option, Curriculum and Instruction Emphasis
AS-3014-223-AP	Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, General Studies Emphasis Discontinuation
AS-3015-223-AP	Apparel Merchandising and Management, B.S. – Apparel Production and Management Option and Apparel Product Development Emphasis Name Changes to Design and Production Option and Apparel Design Emphasis
AS-3016-223-AP	Program Review for MS Hospitality Management

PRESIDENT RESPONSES TO SENATE REPORTS: (0)

- e. ASCSU Report *
- f. Budget Report *
- g. CFA Report *
- h. ASI Report *
- i. Staff Report *

The Staff Report is located on the Academic Senate website at

<https://www.cpp.edu/senate/documents/packets/2022-23/10.19.22/2022.10.19-academic-senate-staff-report.pdf>.

- j. Safer Return Task Force *

* written reports

There was a motion to move to the New Business agenda items prior to Academic Senate Reports due to time sensitivity. The motion received a second and passed with two (2) abstentions.

3. Academic Senate Committee Reports – Time Certain 3:45 p.m.
 a. AA-012-212, Scheduling Rules Update – SECOND READING

The second reading report for AA-012-212, Scheduling Rules Update, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/aa012212sr.pdf>.

Senator Jessie Vallejo presented the report.

M/s to adopt AA-012-212, Scheduling Rules Update.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends adoption of the following principles and guidelines:

Introduction

At Cal Poly Pomona the utilization of online and hybrid approaches to teaching and learning engages 21st-century technology in the delivery of an inclusive polytechnic education. The design of online and hybrid classes helps to make a CPP education accessible to more students, such as those with work, family, or geographic limitations that present challenges for attending traditional in-person classes. The approaches to teaching and learning in online and hybrid environments help to ensure that CPP students develop skills necessary for success in the modern workforce, where technology mediates much of what is done. The combination of knowledge, skills, and habits of mind developed through an inclusive polytechnic education, and mastery of the ability to adapt to and utilize technology to accomplish their goals will prepare CPP students for the future of work.

Online and hybrid education is a modern-day extension of CPP's commitment to experiential learning, multi-disciplinary perspectives, collaboration, and professional readiness in providing a one-of-a-kind educational experience. Consistent with Theme 5 of our Academic Master Plan, CPP is committed to developing online and hybrid academic programs that are high-quality, inclusive, up-to-date, relevant, engaging, and immersive educational experiences that link theory and practice in curricular and co-curricular experiential learning activities.

Guiding Principles

The following principles will guide CPP in the scheduling of classes:

1. *The needs of students must be considered in the development of the class schedule. Lower- division, upper-division and graduate students each require unique considerations. For example, lower-division students tend to need greater in-person opportunities for building community, development of relationships with faculty, and exploration of campus resources.*
2. *The instructional modality of each course must be thoughtfully considered so that it facilitates the student learning outcomes of the course and allows for appropriate pedagogical approaches for student engagement and success.*
3. *Faculty teaching an online or hybrid class will have participated in professional development opportunities centered around the unique issues of teaching in online and hybrid instructional modalities.*
4. *All courses and other educational experiences will be accessible, welcoming and inclusive of all learners.*
5. *Every department is encouraged to develop transparent policies with criteria for determining the instruction mode and instructor for each class section.*

Scheduling Rules

To assure that the class schedule for undergraduate programs is consistent with its face-to-face designation within the CSU, we have established a set of enforceable rules for the class schedule. The Office of Academic Programs, which oversees Scheduling, will take steps to monitor the schedule, assure that colleges and departments have access to necessary information to keep schedules within the rules, and work with deans to ensure that rules are enforced.

Undergraduate class scheduling rules for each academic term:

1. *Classes must be taught with learning outcomes and our inclusive polytechnic identity at the center for all decision making.*
2. *A minimum of 75% of all sections that a department schedules should be in in-person or a hybrid modality. A maximum of 25% of all sections may be fully online. (This ensures that the program remains a face-to-face program.)*
3. *There is no requirement that a department offer online classes.*

~~*A minimum of 80% of lower division sections should be scheduled as in-person or hybrid. (This ensures face-to-face engagement for freshman and sophomores.)*~~

4. *If the program has international students as majors, then the program needs to assure that on-site sections are available (Note: under current rules, international students on F1 Visa are only allowed 1 online class per term.)*
5. *Faculty teaching fully online classes must have training for and/or experience teaching in online modalities.*

Graduate class scheduling rules for each academic term:

1. *Classes must be taught with learning outcomes and our inclusive polytechnic identity at the center for all decision making.*
2. *The class schedule should reflect the program's approved modality*
 - a) *Programs approved as in-person ("on-site") must assure that students are required to complete a minimum of 51% of the curriculum in in-person or hybrid instructional modalities.*
 - b) *Programs approved as hybrid or fully online ("distance") may offer sections of all program courses in any instructional modality determined to be appropriate.*
3. *If the program has international students, then the program needs to assure that on-site sections are available (Note: under current rules, international students on F1 Visa are only allowed 1 online class per term.)*
4. *Faculty teaching fully online classes must have training for and/or experience teaching in online modalities.*

DISCUSSION:

Senator Vallejo commented that she has no personal interest in the class scheduling rules contained in this report. The committee thoroughly went through available data; research that speaks to the pros and cons of online classes and research that considered faculty equity and student success. After the second reading was tabled in September, the committee met three (3) additional times to discuss additional consultations during this time. The consultations included a Qualtrics feedback form made available to the entire campus, discussions with our constituents, a discussion with Provost Brown during our October 5th meeting, and consultations with Laura Massa, Victoria Bhavasar, a Department Chair and Full Professor from CSU Fresno, a Lecturer from CSU Fresno, a Lecturer at CSU Monterey

Bay, an Associate Professor from CSU East Bay, a Full Professor at CSU Long Beach, an Associate Professor at CSU Fullerton, an Academic Senator from CSU Fullerton, a Full Professor from Cal Lutheran, an Academic Senator and Full Professor from UCLA, and three ASCSU representatives.

Based on all the feedback we received, the committee:

- adjusted the guiding principles (added #5) to indicate that departments should create additional guidelines appropriate for their disciplines and student success.
- condensed the percentage rules and chose a number in between the two previously proposed numbers (75%, in between the 70% and 80%).
- clarified that there is no requirement that a department offer online classes (in line with indications from the ASCSU and Provost Brown).
- emphasized that online classes will be capped at 25% and that remaining an in-person, polytechnic university will continue to be a priority for Cal Poly Pomona.

Senator Urey thanked Senator Vallejo and the Academic Affairs Committee on the thoroughness of the report. She added that as a department chair, she appreciates that the two sets of undergraduate rules were combined into one rule but thinks this will still be challenging. Senator Urey voiced her support for the report.

Senator Hanink stated that he was surprised by how fierce the opposition to this report has been and does not understand why this report is so controversial. His interpretation of the scheduling rules presented is that they set a minimum standard for the university. There is no requirement that a department has to offer any online classes. One concern was that faculty could abuse the hybrid definition and not show up to campus. If that is a problem, then the department chair can schedule that faculty member for only face-to-face classes. There are solutions best left to departments as opposed to the Academic Senate dictating what departments should do. Senator Hanink urged the body to adopt this report.

Senator Lloyd commented that he read very carefully the open letter that was circulated and acknowledged the concerns of some of his colleagues but in terms of “allowing” and not “mandating” some flexibility in instructional modalities is a reasonable approach. He added that he understands that the last 2 plus years have been very difficult and should not be taken as a baseline of what hybrid and online classes should be. Hybrid and online classes should be properly designed by faculty who have had support from the university in terms of professional development and resources to make those modalities successful to students. Senator Lloyd appreciated that the report recognizes faculty development, that student learning outcomes must be met, and that the course meets its objectives regardless of modality. These rules allow for departments to have the flexibility needed.

Senator Forward thanked Senator Vallejo and her committee for their due diligence on this report over the course of the last month. Faculty have the option to select course modality in Curriculog. Senator Forward encouraged faculty members to work with their departments to ensure that the modality selected is appropriate for the Student Learning Outcomes. He explained that by law, any online course offered at any CSU is open to all CSU students. Fully Online at <https://www.csufullyonline.com/> is a cross-enrollment program that allows matriculated CSU students to concurrently take one online course at another CSU campus at no additional tuition cost.

Dr. Sethia from the College of Business Administration commented that it appears not everyone agrees with what this report is presenting, and that the intent of the report reduces in-person teaching to 37.5%. In the Provost’s Report, Provost Brown mentioned that the campus is teaching 76% in-person, and these scheduling rules sanction 37.5% in-person instruction. Dr. Sethia stated that if the campus allows 62.5% of all classes to be taught online, the university is no longer a face-to-face institution. According to Dr. Sethia the report’s recommendations are not grounded in the purpose of higher education or in evidence, and it provides no comparative analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the eight different modes of instruction.

Provost Brown clarified that she is not saying the 62.5% of classes will be fully online. She added that there may be confusion regarding the definition of fully online, face-to-face, and hybrid. She emphasized that CPP is a residential campus, and it will always be a residential campus. Students want an in-person experience, and a polytechnic education means we must have hands-on elements. But there is opportunity for innovation and scholarship of teaching and that is where some of the online and hybrid elements come into play. The introduction of hybrid or online where appropriate, where considering curricular and pedagogical decisions should be made with the department chair, in consultation with the dean. The Provost re-iterated that she is not saying that 62.5% of all classes should be online, but there should be flexibility to schedule online and hybrid classes when it is appropriate for student learning outcomes, and that these decisions should be made in consultation with the chair and the dean.

Senator Aragon commented that he wanted to join the people speaking in support of this report. This report is defining a rule that sets a floor, rather than a ceiling. He stated he is less interested in speaking to the merits of the report but wanted to thank the Executive Committee for bringing this report to the Academic Senate floor, the Academic Affairs Committee for all their hard work over two (2) different semesters, and Senator Vallejo for her professionalism during all the consultation, some of which attacked her personally.

Dr. Simarasl from the College of Business Administration remarked that she is not sure where the percentages defined in the report came from and requested that serious research be done to define the appropriate percentages. She added that she believes this policy is based on some bad assumptions, the biggest being that course modality will be based on learning outcomes, when she believes faculty will choose modalities based on their own convenience.

Senator Givens stated that she is currently a member of the Academic Affairs Committee but was not a member last year when this referral came to the committee. She commented that as a department chair, she appreciates the guidelines defined in this report. The Academic Affairs Committee consulted with department chairs and faculty about what would be a reasonable percentage to have as a minimum. The percentages in the report are not based on academic research papers, they are based on extensive consultation on the campus to come up with a commonsense guideline. Senator Givens commented that she considers the recommendation as promoting the campus to be more online but allows for some flexibility when appropriate.

Senator Hanink remarked that the Academic Senate cannot legislate away every possible abuse, every possible misuse, every possible minor case where something falls through the crack, then you defeat the purpose of what rule is trying to be established. The Academic Senate is trying to establish a floor for in-person courses, if there are cases of abuse of this policy, that is something that should be handled by the department, not the Academic Senate.

The conversation continued with the following key discussion points:

- Departments should handle any misuse of the teaching modalities, this includes biases or unfairness of workload
- Online and hybrid classes may help students graduate sooner
- There should be a performance metric related to the teaching mode
- Another referral can be written to correct any issues or correct unanticipated problems caused by the proposed rules in this report

Senator Davidov Pardo asked how supervisory courses are defined for graduate programs. AVP Massa responded that graduate programs are separate from undergraduate programs. For graduate programs minimum of 51% of the curriculum in in-person or hybrid instructional modalities. She added that there will be a Tableau dashboard to help monitor percentages.

The motion to adopt AA-012-212, Scheduling Rules Update, passed with two (2) NO votes and two (2) abstentions.

A motion was made to extend the time certain adjournment to 5:10 p.m. The motion received a second and passed unanimously.

b. [AP-025-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, Diversity and Special Education Emphasis Discontinuation – SECOND READING](#)

The second reading report for AP-025-212, Education, M.A. – Special Education Option, Diversity and Special Education Emphasis Discontinuation, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap025212sr.pdf>.

[AP-026-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Subplan/Option, Curriculum and Instruction Emphasis – SECOND READING](#)

The second reading report for AP-026-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Subplan/Option, Curriculum and Instruction Emphasis, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap026212sr.pdf>.

[AP-027-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, General Studies Emphasis Discontinuation – SECOND READING](#)

The second reading report for AP-027-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, General Studies Emphasis Discontinuation, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap027212sr.pdf>.

Senator Snyder presented the reports.

M/s to adopt AP-025-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, Diversity and Special Education Emphasis Discontinuation, AP-026-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Subplan/Option, Curriculum and Instruction Emphasis, and AP-027-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, General Studies Emphasis Discontinuation.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Academic Programs Committee recommends the discontinuation of the following options/emphases:

- Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, Diversity and Special Education Emphasis
- Education, M.A. - Special Education Subplan/Option, Curriculum and Instruction Emphasis
- Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, General Studies Emphasis

DISCUSSION:

The Education Department proposes to discontinue the Curriculum and Instruction emphasis from the Special Education subplan of the MA Education program.

The rationale for this deletion is to streamline the program and make it less confusing for students. Since the emphasis choice is not articulated anywhere on transcripts or diplomas, faculty have decided that it is an unnecessary part of the special education

subplan. All courses will remain, no courses will be deleted, so students may still select a focus on curriculum and instruction elective graduate courses when planning their MA contract, if interested.

The motion to adopt reports AP-025-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, Diversity and Special Education Emphasis Discontinuation, AP-026-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Subplan/Option, Curriculum and Instruction Emphasis, and AP-027-212, Education, M.A. - Special Education Option, General Studies Emphasis Discontinuation, passed unanimously.

- c. [AP-028-212, Apparel Merchandising and Management, B.S. – Apparel Production and Management Option and Apparel Product Development Emphasis Name Changes to Design and Production Option and Apparel Design Emphasis – SECOND READING](#)

The second reading report for AP-028-212, Apparel Merchandising and Management, B.S. – Apparel Production and Management Option and Apparel Product Development Emphasis Name Changes to Design and Production Option and Apparel Design Emphasis, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap028212sr.pdf>.

M/s to adopt AP-028-212, Apparel Merchandising and Management, B.S. – Apparel Production and Management Option and Apparel Product Development Emphasis Name Changes to Design and Production Option and Apparel Design Emphasis.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Academic Programs Committee recommends that the name of the `Apparel Production and Management` option be changed to `Design and Production Management` and, within that option, the name of the `Apparel Product Development` emphasis be changed to `Apparel Design.`

DISCUSSION:

The Apparel Merchandising and Management Department proposes to change the name of its `Apparel Production and Management` option to `Design and Production Management` and, within that option, the name of the `Apparel Product Development` emphasis to `Apparel Design.` No changes to the degree requirements are being proposed.

The rationale for these name changes is that they better meet student demand and are based on industry recommendations. The new names also better capture current AMM Faculty expertise and the future direction of the program.

During consultation, the Art department raised a concern that the name change might affect the next accreditation review by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), which covers art and design without reference to a university's internal program structure. Dr. Massa, the Art and AMM Chairs, and their respective Associate Deans met and reached agreement on handling future NASAD accreditation together. The concern was withdrawn.

The motion to adopt AP-028-212, Apparel Merchandising and Management, B.S. – Apparel Production and Management Option and Apparel Product Development Emphasis Name Changes to Design and Production Option and Apparel Design Emphasis, passed unanimously.

- d. [AP-032-212, Program Review for MS Hospitality Management – SECOND READING](#)

The second reading report for AP-032-212, Program Review for MS Hospitality Management, is located on the Academic Senate website at <https://academic.cpp.edu/senate/docs/ap032212sr.pdf>.

Senator Snyder presented the report.

M/s to adopt AP-032-212, Program Review for MS Hospitality Management.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Academic Programs Committee commends the Hospitality Management MS Program on their work, in their operation of the program and also in the preparation to get a thorough and thoughtful detailed review highlighting pertinent issues.

DISCUSSION:

This is a self-support program, and the program review mentioned the standard concerns in most program reviews. The external program reviewer's observations and comments about the strengths of the Hospitality Management MS Program at Cal Poly Pomona were very positive. They commented that the Collins College has a well-organized strategic plan and a well-organized assessment plan. The Program has excellent physical resources and opportunities for growth. The reviewers also mentioned several challenges facing this program. The External Program Review team mentioned the possible challenge of the self-funding model of this program, and ways in which this arrangement might impact overall faculty productivity, and how the combination of funding model and University policies limit the types of financial or physical resources available to the MSHM program.

The motion to adopt AP-032-212, Program Review for MS Hospitality Management, passed unanimously.

4. New Business

AB928 Singular GE Transfer Pathway

Information on AB 928: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021, is located at <https://www.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/student-success/AB-928>.

Chair Von Glahn explained that *AB 928: Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act of 2021* was signed into law by Governor Newsom and establishes a singular lower division general education pathway for transfer to both the California State University and the University of California. This single pathway includes eleven (11) courses and 34 units, which is significantly less than CPP's current lower-division GE program. The pathway removes five (5) units of General Education; it removes area E, removes a course from area C, and moves one (1) unit to a laboratory for biological or physical sciences. Cal Poly Pomona has been asked to choose among the following options: support the proposed pathway, oppose the recommendation but recommend specific changes to the proposed pathway that satisfies the requirements of AB 928, or if necessary, declare that the body cannot come to a consensus.

Chair Von Glahn laid out the order of the resolutions to be considered. The first resolution in consideration, [*Resolution in Support of the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal \(June 2022\)*](#), states that Cal Poly Pomona supports the proposed pathway. If it is adopted, then the resolution in opposition to the proposal will not need to be considered.

If the resolution in support of the pathway is not adopted, the next resolution to be considered is the [*Resolution Urging the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates \(ICAS\) to consider that the one-unit 5C Laboratory be integrated into 5A Physical Science \(3 units\) and/or 5B Biological Science \(3 units\) similar to the current CSU General Education Breadth Requirement and one unit of Cal-GETC be devoted to a one-unit first-year seminar course.*](#) This resolution opposes the proposed

pathway and encourages the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to consider that the one-unit 5C laboratory be integrated into 5A Physical Science (3 units) and/or 5B Biological Science (3 units) like the current CSU General Education Breadth Requirement and one unit of Cal-GETC be devoted to a one-unit first-year seminar course.

The adoption of the *Resolution Urging the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to consider that the one-unit 5C Laboratory be integrated into 5A Physical Science (3 units) and/or 5B Biological Science (3 units) similar to the current CSU General Education Breadth Requirement and one unit of Cal-GETC be devoted to a one-unit first-year seminar course* does not preclude the Academic Senate from adopting the next two (2) resolutions, which includes the [Sense of the Senate on the application of the AB 928 GE Common Pathway for Transfer to first-time college students starting at Cal Poly Pomona](#), which is a call for further consultation on the matter of the fate of the five units removed from the lower division general education pattern. This resolution is not in conflict with any other resolution being presented today.

The next resolution that is not in conflict with the support or opposition resolutions is the [Resolution in Opposition to the Reduction of Area C \(Arts and Humanities\) in the CSU Lower Division General Education Pattern](#). This resolution will be introduced by a College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences constituent and will lay out the college's concerns about the reduction of General Education units in Arts and Humanities.

ASCSU Senator Forward explained that AB 928 has been signed into law and that law states that the General Education common pathway cannot be any greater than what is currently available to community college transfer students. It sets a cap at 34 units so there is a five (5) unit reduction for the CSUs that is not voluntary, it is mandated by law. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) is a group of Academic Senate leaders from each of the three segments of public higher education in California, CSU, UC, and California Community College (CCC). It meets for the purpose of jointly addressing matters of academic importance to all three segments. The Committee is composed of five members from each of the three segments, including the chair and the vice chair of each academic senate. In June 2022, the ICAS submitted the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) pathway to the three (3) systems with instructions to provide feedback that takes on one of the following three (3) positions regarding the proposal:

- Support the June 2022 ICAS Cal-GETC proposal
- Recommend specific changes that satisfy the requirements of AB 928, with rationale, or
- Unable to come to a consensus

Senator Forward provided details of the general education pattern in the [Resolution in Support of the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal \(June 2022\)](#).

IGETC Area	Subject	Units	Similar CSU GE-Breadth Requirement
1	1A	English Composition	A2
	1B	Critical Thinking & Composition	A3
	1C	Oral Communication	A1
2	2A	Mathematical Concepts & Quantitative Reasoning	B4
3	3A	Arts	C1
	3B	Humanities	C2
4	4	Social & Behavioral Sciences	D
		Social & Behavioral Sciences	D
5	5A	Physical Science	B1
	5B	Biological Science	B2
	5C	Laboratory (for Bio/Phys Sci course)	B3
7		Ethnic Studies	F
Total		34 units	

Senator Forward noted that oral communication was not originally in the proposal. CSU faculty

advocated for oral communication, so oral communication was added to the ICAS Cal-GETC proposal. The other aspect that was added was the one (1) unit lab (5C). Currently if you think about B1, B2, and B3, which requires a minimum of six (6) units, where the lab is integrated into either B1 or B2. This proposal makes B1, B2, and B3 a minimum of seven (7) units. There is a loss of one course in the areas C1 and C2.

M/s to adopt the [Resolution in Support of the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal \(June 2022\)](#).

There was a request for Senator Forward to discuss the consultation process and speak how the *Resolution in Support of the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal (June 2022)* came to the Academic Senate floor. Senator Aragon commented that the body should forcefully oppose the ICAS proposal because it drastically diminishes the role of General Education at Cal Poly Pomona, it diminishes role of the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences in preparing CSU undergraduate students to be responsible citizens and lifelong learners, and it demonstrates a failure to recognize the value of these disciplines. He added that this proposal repeats a pattern of a narrow range of educators and non-educators making curricular decisions. Senator Aragon stated that he disagrees with the process not just the content of the proposal.

Senator Forward responded regarding the consultation that the law states that each of the higher education systems, UC, CSU, and Community College, would be represented on a committee (ICAS) and come up with a common GE pathway. The committee met in March 2022, and there was an online forum requesting feedback and there was a large amount of feedback associated to oral communication which was then added to the common GE pathway. The committee has until May 2023 to come up with a common GE pathway pattern that is accepted by a majority of the committee. If ICAS cannot come to agreement, then according to the law, the administrations of the three systems will decide on the common pathway. Senator Forward added that he and Senator Urey have for the last couple of weeks been talking to faculty members, senators, and holding open forums on this subject. There was an online poll in which thirty (30) faculty members participated and there was not one (1) vote in favor of the proposed GE pathway.

Senator Urey urged the body to vote NO on the *Resolution in Support of the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal (June 2022)*. She added that there a couple other resolutions that require a vote today and those resolutions can only be considered if there is a NO vote for the resolution in support of the proposal.

Senator Small urged a NO vote on the resolution in support of the current ICAS proposal. He added that he has no illusions that the body can stop this proposal from going forward, but a NO vote means that CPP is on the record in opposition to the current proposal.

The motion to adopt the *Resolution in Support of the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal (June 2022)* failed with thirty-three (33) NO votes and one (1) abstention.

Chair Von Glahn stated that the next resolution to be considered is the [Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal \(June 2022\)](#). He clarified that a YES vote in opposition to the current proposal does not preclude the body from adopting a resolution requesting changes to the proposal.

M/s to adopt the *Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal (June 2022)*.

The motion to adopt the *Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed ICAS Cal-GETC Proposal (June 2022)* passed unanimously.

The next resolution to be considered is [Resolution "Sense of the Senate on the application of the AB](#)

[928 GE Common Pathway for Transfer to first-time college students starting at Cal Poly Pomona](#)”.

M/s to adopt the *Resolution “Sense of the Senate on the application of the AB 928 GE Common Pathway for Transfer to first-time college students starting at Cal Poly Pomona”*.

Senator Urey explained that *AB 928 - Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act* will result in a lower division general education pattern that has five (5) units fewer than the current CSU lower division general education pattern. This resolution’s purpose is to ask for thorough consultation on the matter of the five (5) units removed from the lower division general education pattern.

Senator Lloyd stated his support for this resolution because the call for added consultation is critical. This current process was done in a very top-down fashion. Most faculty recognize the importance of general education and AB 928 is just the latest in a thinning of general education that has been going on for a while. The call for further consultation about the five (5) units that is being freed up by this new GE pattern is entirely well founded.

The motion to adopt the *Resolution “Sense of the Senate on the application of the AB 928 GE Common Pathway for Transfer to first-time college students starting at Cal Poly Pomona”* passed with one (1) NO vote.

The next resolution to be considered is the [Resolution in Opposition to the Reduction of Area C \(Arts and Humanities\) in the CSU Lower Division General Education Pattern](#).

M/s to adopt the *Resolution in Opposition to the Reduction of Area C (Arts and Humanities) in the CSU Lower Division General Education Pattern*.

Senator Aragon stated that this resolution forcefully opposes the content of the ICAS proposal and the process that decided the new GE pathway. This resolution notes that the Cal-GETC reflects an ongoing pattern of modifying GE breadth requirements in ways that reduce or diminish the role of the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences in a well-rounded education. The resolution stands in opposition to the process where a breadth of educators was not consulted about the outcome of general education. The resolution also asks the CPP administration to defend the value of general education, specifically the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences and that there should be faculty consultation about general education after the new GE pathway is imposed on the campus.

Senator Hanink spoke about the frustration and fear of his College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences colleagues. He noted that the reduction of general education courses is a trend in higher education for over a decade. He explained when the Area F, Ethnic Studies, requirements were added, there was a zero-sum gain because Area D3 was removed. Now Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences are being asked to accommodate a diminished number of seats, pitting departments against each other. Senator Hanink commented that the greater context is that academic freedom is under attack, especially the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences.

Senator Pacleb asked her colleagues across all colleges to consider what is going on regarding general education. During discussions of adding an Ethnic Studies requirement, most faculty agreed with the need for this requirement but did not agree with the top-down interpretation from the Chancellor’s Office which created GE Area F and by doing that eliminated Area D3. At that time there was a similar resolution, [Resolution in Opposition to the Chancellor’s Proposed Process for Implementation of AB 1460](#), which also identified deteriorating general education, especially in the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. As leaders and teachers, teaching a new generation of students that need Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences now more than ever, Senator Pacleb urged senators to adopt this resolution.

Senator Lloyd asked the statewide senators, as a practical matter of understanding how these resolutions will be received at a state level, what is the difference between not reaching consensus and passing a forceful opposition resolution? ASCSU Senator Urey responded that not reaching a consensus can be seen as “mushy”, or the campus simply cannot decide. Passing a resolution that is in forceful opposition sends a clear message that faculty are unhappy with the nature of the consultation and the outcome. Senator Urey added that this will go to a committee, and she is not sure how all the feedback will be processed by that committee.

ASCSU Senator Forward added that it is important for the campus to have a position and for that position to be heard. The committee that requested the feedback, the Academic Preparation and Educational Programs Committee asked for one of the following three (3) positions regarding the proposal:

- a. Support the June 2022 ICAS Cal-GETC proposal
- b. Recommend specific changes that satisfy the requirements of AB 928, with rationale, or
- c. Unable to come to a consensus

They intentionally left out opposition since it is not actionable. His opinion is that if the CSU opposes this without recommending any changes, and the UC and CC accept the proposal, the CSU System is locked out of the decision-making process. If there is inaction, the definition of the 34-unit lower division GE pathway will be left to the administration, and it is preferable to have this be a faculty driven process.

Dr. Kopplin, Chair of the Music Department, commented that the Music Department hires many lecturers to teach individual instruments and then those lecturers teach Area C classes. One of the unintended consequences of this is that our department will not have the budget to afford as many lecturers, because there will not be as many GE courses required. His opinion is that this will devastate part-time employment in the Music Department. He stated that this is a bad way to do business, and disingenuous to say we must go along with this change.

Senator Aragon remarked that he agrees with opposing Cal-GETC and that he is also concerned with pragmatics but does not have any illusions that these efforts will change the process. This resolution is not specifically about communicating upward, but is a chance for this body, as representatives of the university, to decide that we care about general education and all its facets, and that we care about the important role that the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences play in training critical thinkers. But also, general education prepares students to be responsible citizens and life-long learners. This resolution is an opposition statement that sets a common ground for what we are going to do going forward and it is consistent with opposing the current proposal and putting forth recommendations that satisfy the requirements of AB 928.

Senator Van spoke to the process. After speaking with several constituents in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences, given their experiences, they had ideas about how to make the 34-unit GE pathway work. But when they looked at the timeline to offer feedback, there was the sense that no one was really interested in their feedback because of the short turnaround time.

The motion to adopt *Resolution in Opposition to the Reduction of Area C (Arts and Humanities) in the CSU Lower Division General Education Pattern* passed unanimously.

The final resolution is to [Urge the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates \(ICAS\) to consider the one-unit 5C Laboratory being integrated into a one-unit first-year seminar course.](#)

M/s to adopt the resolution to *Urge the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to consider the one-unit 5C Laboratory being integrated into a one-unit first-year seminar course.*

Senator Forward stated that this resolution recommends a specific change that still satisfies AB 928. First Year Experience (FYE) courses were in GE Area E which does not exist in the current Cal-

GETC proposal. This resolution urges the IACS to consider that the one-unit 5C Laboratory be integrated into 5A Physical Science (3 units) and/or 5B Biological Science (3 units) like the current CSU General Education Breadth Requirement and one unit of Cal-GETC be devoted to a one-unit first-year seminar course.

The motion to adopt the resolution to *Urge the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) to consider the one-unit 5C Laboratory being integrated into a one-unit first-year seminar course* passed with two (2) NO votes.

The October 19, 2022 Academic Senate meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.