

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, October 29, 2025

CLA Building, 98, P2-8

Zoom Link: <https://cpp.zoom.us/j/82531279674>

Zoom ID: 825 3127 9674

Passcode: executive

Attendees: Greg Barding, Aaron Cayer, David Edens, Ghada Gad, Peter Hanink, Rita Kumar, Kelly Min, Brian Newman, Dennis Quinn, Julie Shen, Faye Wachs, and Gerd Welke.

Guests: Mohammad Husain and Jeffrey Roy

1) Minutes

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes from October 22, 2025

There was no discussion.

Senator Barding motioned to approve the meeting minutes. Senator Eden second.

M/s/p to approve the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes for October 22, 2025.

2) Chair's Report

1. Meeting with the Provost and President

Chair Hanink reported that he and Vice Chair Barding met with the Provost and President last week to discuss a variety of topics, many of which are still under development. Key points included:

• **Faculty Accommodation Obligations:**

Discussion centered on how the Disability Resource Center (DRC) communicates faculty obligations regarding student accommodations. A specific concern was raised about accommodations that may require a course, originally scheduled as in-person, to be offered virtually. This raises questions about whether such accommodations effectively create HyFlex course models. Dr. Cecilia Santiago-Gonzalez will follow up with further information.

• **Senate Budget and Resources:**

It was confirmed that the Senate has an allocated budget. This will support the procurement of necessary supplies and the hiring of a student assistant. Casandra L.

Horner, Senate Coordinator, will mentor and train the intern, particularly in preparation for the busy spring season and the emeritus reception.

- **Ad Hoc Committee on GE Recertification:**

The possibility of forming an ad hoc committee to focus on General Education (GE) recertification was discussed. Provost Gomez expressed openness to this idea and will explore the feasibility, including potential compensation for committee members.

2. Strategic Engagement with Leadership

Chair Hanink conveyed a request from President Levine encouraging the Senate to use its time with university leadership more strategically. Rather than posing isolated questions with brief answers, members are encouraged to consider broader systemic or policy-related issues. For example, instead of asking procedural questions, members might explore topics such as organizational structure or communication pathways within the university.

Provost Gomez emphasized the importance of identifying one or two key priorities that the Senate would like to accomplish within the academic year. While recognizing that some larger initiatives may be more appropriate for the incoming president, the Senate is encouraged to focus on achievable goals for the current year.

3. Discussion on Proposed Ad Hoc GE Recertification Committee

Senator Quinn addressed the recent mention of forming an **ad hoc General Education (GE) Recertification Committee**, raising several important points and questions:

- **Rationale for a Separate Committee:**

Although a standing GE Committee already exists, the proposed ad hoc committee is intended to alleviate the **overwhelming workload** expected due to a large volume of **GE course recertifications**. These recertifications are distinct from the GE Committee's usual responsibilities, which typically involve reviewing new course proposals.

- **Nature of the Work:**

The recertification process is anticipated to be relatively **straightforward**, potentially allowing for a streamlined review process. The ad hoc committee could serve as a mechanism to **efficiently process** these submissions, ensuring they are completed properly without overburdening the existing GE Committee.

- **Committee Authority and Oversight:**

Questions were raised about the **decision-making authority** of the proposed committee—whether it would make final decisions or submit recommendations back to the GE Committee for approval. It was clarified that the committee is still in the **discussion phase** and has not yet been formally proposed or structured.

- **Potential Leadership:**

Senator Greg mentioned that **Mario** has expressed interest in **chairing the ad hoc committee**, which would remain under the **oversight of the Senate**. This would ensure continuity and alignment with existing governance structures.

- **One-Time Initiative:**
The ad hoc committee is envisioned as a **temporary body**, formed specifically to address the **one-time influx** of GE recertification submissions prompted by the CalGETC initiative.

4. Broader Concerns and Process Improvements

- **Social Sciences in GE:**
Senator Quinn highlighted ongoing concerns regarding the **representation and treatment of social sciences** within the GE framework. There is a need for a **more workable and meaningful solution** to address these issues.
- **Timeline and Consultation Challenges:**
Feedback from college committees indicates that **current timelines** for GE processes are **unrealistic**, limiting opportunities for **meaningful consultation and input** from key stakeholders. This has contributed to ongoing challenges that may be mitigated by **revisiting and refining** procedural timelines.
- **Backlog of GE Course Proposals:**
It was noted that **new GE course proposals have been paused**, resulting in a **backlog** that may further strain the GE Committee. This backlog reinforces the need for additional support, such as the proposed ad hoc committee.

5. CPGE Dean Search Committee Membership Update

Chair Hanink provided an important update regarding the **College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE) Dean Search Committee:**

- It was recently discovered that **Richard Navarro**, who had been appointed to the CPGE Dean Search Committee during the previous meeting, is a **FERB (Faculty Early Retirement Program) faculty member**.
- According to **Policy 1310**, FERB faculty are **ineligible to serve on search committees for administrative roles**.
- Chair Hanink has already contacted Dr. Navarro to **thank him for his willingness to serve** and to inform him of his ineligibility.

6. Proposal to Reopen the Call for Nominations

In light of this development, Chair Hanink proposed **reopening the call for nominations** to fill the now-vacant position on the search committee. Key points of the discussion included:

- **Short Timeline:**
The call would be reopened for a brief period, potentially until **Friday or Monday**, to expedite the process.
- **Previous Applicants:**
Casandra L. Horner had already notified the two previous applicants who were not selected. Rather than simply reinstating one of them, Chair Hanink suggested

reopening the call to allow for broader participation and to address concerns about **diversity and representation** across colleges.

- **Diversity Considerations:**

Both Provost Gomez and Senator Kumar emphasized the importance of ensuring **diverse representation** on the committee. Since the two previous applicants were both from the **College of Business**, reopening the call could provide an opportunity to include voices from other disciplines.

- **Alternative Suggestions:**

- Some members suggested **reconsidering the two original applicants** without reopening the call, to avoid confusion or discouragement among applicants.
- Others supported **reopening the call** while also **reaching out to the original applicants** to ask if they would like to remain in consideration, rather than requiring them to reapply.
- It was noted that the previously selected candidate had stood out significantly, which may have influenced the level of consideration given to the other applicants. Reopening the call could allow for a more thorough review of all potential candidates.

- **Next Steps:**

Chair Hanink agreed to **reach out to the two original applicants** to inform them of the situation and offer them the option to remain in the pool. The committee will proceed based on the responses received and any new applications submitted during the reopened call.

3) Vice Chair's Report

GE-001-256 PHL 3550 – Artificial Intelligence for Thinking Humans: A History (New GE Area 5D) – **REFERRAL**

There was no discussion.

Senator Eden motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Welke second.

M/s/p to send GE-001-256 to the General Education Committee.

GE-002-256 PLT 4020 – Agricultural Drone Technology (New GE Area 5D) – **REFERRAL**

There was no discussion.

Senator Eden motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Barding second.

M/s/p to send GE-002-256 to the General Education Committee.

FA-002-256 Syllabus Policy Update (Policy 1200) – **REFERRAL**

Vice Chair Barding presented an overview and initial thoughts on FA-002-256, a proposed update to the university’s syllabus policy. Key points included:

- **AI and Academic Integrity:**
The primary proposed change is the inclusion of a **required statement on academic integrity related to AI**. Vice Chair Barding expressed strong support for this addition, noting that many faculty members currently lack such language in their syllabi and may be unprepared to address AI-related academic misconduct.
- **Faculty Experiences:**
Anecdotal evidence was shared about faculty encountering AI-generated responses during exams without prior policy guidance in place. Including clear language in syllabi would help **protect both faculty and students** by setting expectations.
- **Additional Recommendations:**
The proposal also includes **non-mandatory recommendations**, such as:
 - Including a **workload statement** in syllabi.
 - Creating an **official archive of syllabi**.

Vice Chair Barding expressed reservations about including procedural elements—such as the syllabi archive—in policy, suggesting that such items may be better suited for procedural documentation rather than formal policy.

- **Concerns About Syllabus Ownership:**
A discussion followed regarding **intellectual property rights** related to syllabi. Syllabi are usually considered faculty-owned.
- **Document Clarity:**
Some confusion was noted regarding the **track changes** in the proposal. It appears that only the AI-related language was formally proposed for inclusion, while other items were presented as recommendations without tracked edits. The AI language was added by Dr. Laura Massa and appears at the end of the document.
- **Next Steps:**
Vice Chair Barding recommended that the proposal be **sent to committee** for further review and clarification, particularly to address the distinction between policy and procedure, and to evaluate the implications of the proposed changes.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to return to author. Senator Eden second.

M/s/p to send FA-002-256 back to author for further development.

AA-004-256 Request for a New Mode of Teaching (Online Lecture + In-Class Exam) – **REFERRAL**

Vice Chair Barding mentioned that AA-004-256 was sent back to author to remove confidential information from the referral. Once revised, AA-004-256 will be added to an upcoming Executive Committee Meeting Agenda for consideration.

4) Reports

Presented by Dr. Jeffrey Roy, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee

AA-004-245 Instructor of Record Must Be A Qualified Person

Senator Roy presented an overview of referral AA-004-245, submitted by **Professor Dale Turner**, Chair of the Department of Philosophy. The referral proposes the introduction of **explicit policy language** to prevent the use of **AI bots as instructors of record** at the university.

Background and Context:

- The referral was inspired by a **recent policy passed at CSU Bakersfield (CSUB)**, which amended their faculty hiring policy to explicitly prohibit AI from serving as instructors of record.
- It also aligns with a **California community college bill passed in June 2024**, which mandates that instructors of record must be **human individuals** who meet **minimum faculty qualifications**.
- The referral seeks to ensure that **only qualified human faculty** can serve in instructional roles at Cal Poly Pomona (CPP), in accordance with **state education code** and **CSU system policies**.

Consultation and Feedback:

- The committee conducted **extensive outreach**, gathering input from:
 - Department chairs
 - College deans
 - Faculty Affairs
 - California Faculty Association (CFA)
 - The University Library
- The proposal received **broad support** across stakeholders.
- Notable contributions included:
 - **Dean Janelle Pitt Parker (CEIS)**: Provided detailed suggestions for supportive language.
 - **Dr. Cheryl Koos (Faculty Affairs)**: Offered general support and brief comments.
 - **Dr. Gekara**: Recommended consulting the **Department of Computer Science** for technical accuracy.
 - **Dr. Yoro**: Raised concerns about the phrasing of “human individuals” versus “human beings,” noting that the former could be interpreted to include AI entities.

Language and Legal Considerations:

- The committee reviewed CSUB’s **policy language** and compared it with **California Education Code** and **Title V** regulations.
- It was determined that **state-level language** consistently uses the term “**person**” or “**people**”, without distinguishing between “human individuals” and “human beings.”
- The committee concluded that aligning with **state terminology** would be the most appropriate and legally sound approach.

Committee Deliberations:

- While there was consensus on the **intent** of the referral—to prevent AI from serving as instructors of record, the committee noted that the **referral lacked specific policy recommendations**.
- The referral was interpreted as a **general statement of support** for CSUB’s approach, rather than a concrete proposal for new or revised policy at CPP.
- The committee remains open to further discussion and potential development of formal policy language, pending additional guidance or a more detailed referral.

Questions and Comments from the Floor:

- **Clarification on Minimum Qualifications:**
 - **Senator Welke** inquired about the **minimum qualifications** required to serve as an instructor of record and whether there is a formal policy governing this.
 - It was noted that while **terminal degrees** are generally expected, there is **departmental discretion** in hiring decisions. For example, in the **fine arts**, an **MFA** is considered a terminal degree, and **adjuncts** often teach lower-division courses without a Ph.D.
 - **Senator Gad** added that while a **master’s degree** is typically required for adjuncts, exceptions have been made in cases where individuals possess **significant professional experience**, even if they only hold a **bachelor’s degree**. These cases often require additional administrative approval.
- **Concerns About Policy Clarity and Purpose:**
 - **Senator Kumar** raised a key concern regarding the **lack of a specific action or policy recommendation** in the referral. She noted that while **resolutions** are typically used to express general sentiments, **referrals** usually propose concrete policy changes.
 - The current referral appears to be more of a **statement of support** for the CSUB policy rather than a **proposal for a new or revised policy** at CPP.
 - This ambiguity raises questions about the **next steps** if the referral were to proceed through the standard approval process, as it may not result in any **tangible policy change**.

Summary of Key Issues:

- There is **broad support** for the principle that **AI should not serve as instructors of record**.
- The referral lacks **specific policy language or actionable recommendations**, making it difficult to determine the appropriate procedural path.
- Clarification is needed from the **referral's author** to determine whether the intent is to propose a **new policy**, **amend an existing one**, or simply **issue a resolution of support**.
- The committee discussed the importance of **clear and precise language**, especially regarding terms like “human individuals” versus “human beings,” and aligning with **state-level terminology** such as “person” or “people.”

Senator Barding motioned to send report to the author. Senator Newman second.

M/s/p to send AA-004-245 to author for further development.

Presented by Dr. Mohammad Husain, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee

AP-004-256 Academic Credit Certificate Programs Update

Senator Husain presented an overview of AP-004-256, which proposes updates to the university’s policy on academic credit-bearing certificate programs. The update was prompted by recent developments and compliance requirements. Key points included:

- **Background and Rationale:**
 - Several departments had proposed academic credit-bearing certificates in collaboration with the **College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE)**.
 - These programs were **financially unsustainable** and became **ineligible for federal financial aid** following policy changes in **Summer 2024**.
 - In response, the **Office of Academic Programs** and **CPGE** collaborated to revise the policy to ensure compliance with updated CSU and federal guidelines.
- **Key Policy Changes:**
 - **Eligibility Restriction:** Academic credit certificates may now **only be offered to stateside matriculated students**. They are no longer permitted through **self-support programs**.
 - **Integration with Degree Programs:** Certificates must be part of an **existing degree program**.
 - **Unit Requirements Adjusted:**
 - **Undergraduate certificates:** 9–12 units, with at least 6 upper-division units.
 - **Graduate certificates:** 6–9 units, primarily 5000-level courses.
 - This change aligns with **financial aid limitations**, ensuring students remain eligible for aid.

- **Financial Aid Implications:**
 - Certificates **may not be eligible for financial aid**, particularly if the associated degree program already exceeds the **federal unit cap** (e.g., 120–130 units).
 - Departments proposing certificates must be cautious, as exceeding unit thresholds could **disqualify students from aid**.
 - The policy aims to **prevent confusion** and **miscommunication** that previously led students to enroll in ineligible programs.
- **Additional Notes:**
 - The proposal includes a **summary table** comparing the old and new policies, with key changes highlighted in **bold and italics**.
 - The policy also addresses **certificate integrity**, including limits on repetition and eligibility criteria.

Senator Husain emphasized the importance of understanding the **financial and academic implications** of these changes and encouraged departments to review the policy carefully before proposing new certificate programs.

Following Senator Husain’s presentation, the floor was opened for questions and discussion regarding the proposed policy changes. Key points included:

- **Clarification on Financial Aid Eligibility:**
 - It was confirmed that the policy does **not categorically exclude** academic credit certificates from financial aid eligibility. Rather, certificates **may or may not be eligible**, depending on the total number of units in a student’s degree program.
 - A **proposal review process** will be implemented to determine eligibility early on, with guidance from the **Office of Academic Programs (OAP)** and the **Office of Institutional Planning (OIP)**.
 - Certificates will be **noted on student transcripts**.
- **Request for Language Clarification:**
 - The Executive Committee requested that the **language regarding financial aid eligibility** be clarified to avoid misinterpretation. It was agreed that a revision would be made to ensure the policy clearly communicates the conditional nature of aid eligibility.
 - Senator Husain confirmed that Dr. **Laura Massa** had already approved the clarification, pending feedback from this meeting.
- **Distinctness of Certificate Coursework:**
 - A question was raised about the requirement that **at least 6 units of certificate coursework be distinct from the student’s major**.
 - It was clarified that these courses should not overlap with **major electives** and must be **entirely separate** from the student’s primary field of study. This is consistent with existing rules for **minors and options**.
 - The intent is to **prevent unintentional completion** of certificates by students through their major coursework.
- **Impact on Existing Certificate Programs:**

- Existing academic certificate programs will need to **align with the new policy definitions and unit requirements**.
- For example, a **German certificate program** may need to remove or add courses to meet the new unit thresholds or consider converting to a minor.
- The policy distinguishes between **Academic Credit Certificates** and **Professional Development Certificates**:
 - Professional Development Certificates (e.g., in specialized software or skills) may still be offered through **self-support** and **CPGE**, but they will not be classified as academic certificates nor carry academic credit.
- **Eligibility and Access:**
 - Only **matriculated students** are eligible to pursue academic credit certificates. Non-matriculated students cannot enroll in these programs or claim certificates through **Open University**.
 - Concerns were raised about **Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) pathways** and how certificate programs might impact **unit limits** and **financial aid eligibility**. These will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
- **Historical Context:**
 - It was noted that only **two self-support academic certificates** have been offered through CPGE in the past two years. During that time, CPGE experienced **leadership and structural challenges**, which contributed to the need for policy clarification and reform.

Senator Shen motioned to send report to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Wachs second.

M/s/p to send AP-004-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for November 5, 2025.

AP-012-245 Program Review for BA in Spanish

There was no discussion.

Senator Barding motioned to send report to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Newman second.

M/s/p to send AP-012-245 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for November 5, 2025.

AP-013-245 Program Review for MA, Education

There was no discussion.

Senator Barding motioned to send report to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Eden second.

M/s/p to send AP-013-245 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for November 5, 2025.

AP-017-245 New Spanish Media Minor

There was no discussion.

Senator Barding motioned to send report to the senate meeting agenda. Senator Eden second.

M/s/p to send AP-017-245 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for November 5, 2025.

5) Old Business

The Executive Committee appointed the following senator to the Academic Senate Standing Committee Assignment for AY2025-2026:

- Senator Michael Giang (CLASS) – ASI Liaison

6) New Business

Tentative Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for November 5, 2025

The Executive Committee recommended the removal of AA-004-245 “Instructor of Record Must Be A Qualified Person” from the meeting agenda.

Senator Barding motioned to approve the senate meeting agenda. Senator Quinn second.

M/s/p to approve the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for November 5, 2025.

7) Discussion

There was a brief discussion on the appeal process for faculty emeritus.

Adjourned @ 4:49 PM