CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, November 19, 2025
CLA Building, 98, P2-8
Zoom Link: https://cpp.zoom.us/j/84308243425
Zoom ID: 843 0824 3425
Passcode: executive

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

Proxy: Senator Ghada Gad for Senators Aaron Cayer and Brian Newman

Guests: Mohammad Husain and Jeffrey Roy (via Zoom)

1) Minutes

   Executive Committee Meeting Minutes from November 12, 2025

   There was no discussion.

   Senator Barding motioned to approve the minutes. Senator Edens second.

   M/s/p to approve the Executive Committee Meeting Minutes from November 12, 2025.

2) Chair's Report

   Impasse Update

   - Senator Kumar: Asked if there was any update regarding the potential December 10th Executive Committee (EC) meeting.
   - Chair Hanink:
     o Reported that there is no update yet on the December 10th EC meeting.
     o Explained that impasse meetings are currently taking place today and tomorrow.
     o Clarified the process:
       ▪ Impasse meetings occur between department chairs, relevant college deans, and Laura Masa.
       ▪ After these meetings, if an impasse remains, AVP Laura Massa will prepare a background report, which will then be sent to the committee.
     o Confirmed he will keep everyone informed, acknowledging that members want to finalize plans for December 10, 2025.

Questions:
- No additional questions were raised.

Action Items:
- Chair Hanink will provide updates after the impasse meetings conclude, and the background report is prepared (if necessary).

3) Vice Chair's Report

AA-005-256   Correction to Cross Listing Policy 1122 - REFERRAL

1. Overview

- Referral: AA-005-256 proposes a correction to the Cross-Listing Policy.
- Issue Identified:
  - Current policy language includes staffing details that may conflict with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).
- Proposed Change:
  - Remove one problematic sentence and add a supporting sentence with documentation.
  - Change is minimal but necessary for compliance.

---

2. Additional Context

- Discussion noted that the term "consult" appears in Section 2.7 of the policy.
- Concern raised about ambiguity in defining consultation:
  - Current usage may imply consensus rather than advisory input.
  - Suggestion: Address this in a separate referral to clarify the definition of consultation across policies.

---

3. Motion

- Vice Chair Barding Motion: Send AA-005-256 to committee for review.
- Second: Motion seconded by Senator Quinn.
- Vote:
  - All in favor: Yes
  - Opposed: None
  - Abstentions: None
- Result: Motion passes.

---

4. Outcome

- Referral AA-005-256 will be forwarded to the appropriate committee for further review and action.
- Separate referral recommended for defining **consultation** in policy language.

Vice Chair Barding to send the referral to committee. Senator Quinn second.

M/s/p to send AA-005-256 to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Discussion:

- Vice Chair Barding: Expressed intent to consolidate referrals.
- Chair Hanink:
  - Confirmed the need to move to consolidate.
  - Referenced prior email details: AP009256 to AP017256.
  - Vice Chair Barding made a formal motion: "Move to consolidate those referrals."
- Action:
  - Motion was seconded by Senator Edens.
  - No objections noted.

Outcome:

- Vice Chair Barding motioned to consolidate AP-009-256 through AP-017-256. Senator Edens second.

AP-009-256   Agriculture, M.S. – (Program Name, CSU Degree Code, and CIP Code Changes) - REFERRAL

Senator Shen recommended revising the name of the referral.

AP-010-256   Early Childhood Studies, B.A. – Integrative Teacher Education Program (ITEP) Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs (Discontinue Option) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

AP-011-256   Early Childhood Studies, B.A. – Integrative Teacher Education Program (ITEP) Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs (Discontinue Option) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

AP-012-256   Early Childhood Studies, B.A. – Non-Teaching (Discontinue Option) -
              REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

AP-013-256   Footwear Design and Merchandising Minor (Discontinue Minor) -
              REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

AP-014-256   Liberal Studies, B.A. – Integrative Teacher Education Program (ITEP)
              Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs (Discontinue Option) -
              REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

AP-015-256   Liberal Studies, B.A. – Integrative Teacher Education Program (ITEP)
              Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs (Discontinue
              Option) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

AP-016-256   M.S. in Sustainability and Regenerative Studies – (Program Name
Change) - REFERRAL

Senator Shen recommended revising the name of the referral.

AP-017-256   Electrical and Computer Engineering Department Split - REFERRAL

The Executive Committee added the Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs,
Psychology and Sociology Faculty Members to the Recommended Resources section of
the referral.

Senator Edens to send the AP referrals to committee. Senator Quinn second.

M/s/p to send AP-009-256 through AP-017-256 to the Academic Programs Committee.

EP-001-256   Academic Senate Representation for Part-Time Lecturer Faculty -
              REFERRAL

1. Overview

- Referral: EP-001-256 is a follow-up to a similar referral submitted last year.
- Purpose:
  - Proposal to open eligibility for Academic Senate elections to part-time lecturers, in addition to full-time lecturers.
  - Does not create new Senate seats or alter reapportionment by college.

---

2. Key Discussion Points

- Clarifications Needed Before Committee Review:
  - Define time base for part-time lecturers (informal discussions suggested 50%).
  - Specify which section of the Constitution is being amended.
  - Clearly state that the change adds part-time lecturers (.5-time base) to the list of those eligible to run for Senate.
- Difference from Previous Referral:
  - This version does not introduce new positions; it simply expands eligibility.
- Questions Raised:
  - Senator Julie Shen: Asked which part of the Constitution is affected and requested explicit language in the referral.
  - Senator Gerd Welke: Confirmed that this change does not impact reapportionment or regular Senate seat allocation.

---

3. Motion

- Senator Kumar Motion: Send EP-001-256 to committee with clarifications noted.
- Second: Motion seconded by Senator Shen.
- Vote:
  - All in favor: Yes
  - Opposed: None
  - Abstentions: None
- Result: Motion passes.

---

4. Outcome

- Referral will be forwarded to the Elections and Procedures Committee.
- Committee will clarify:
  - Constitutional section affected.
  - Time base definition for part-time lecturers.
  - Exact language for eligibility inclusion.

- Vice Chair Barding introduced the referral:
  - It is similar to a referral submitted last year and is now moving through Elections and Procedures Committee.
  - The current referral does not create a new category but proposes to open eligibility to part-time lecturers in addition to full-time lecturers.
  - Clarification needed on:
    - Definition of part-time (informal discussions suggested 50% time base).
    - Specific section of the Constitution being amended.
    - Explicit language stating the change (e.g., adding "part-time lecturers with a .5-time base" to the eligibility list).
- Senator Julie Shen emphasized the importance of clearly identifying:
  - Which part of the Constitution is changing?
  - The exact time base proposed for inclusion.
- Senator Shen recommended:
  - Sending the referral to the committee with a note requesting these clarifications rather than delaying until spring.
  - Direction for the committee: specify the motion to include part-time lecturers at .5-time base in eligibility for Senate elections.
- Motion:
  - Chair Hanink asked for a motion to send the referral to the committee with clarifications requested.
  - Motion seconded by Julie Shen.
  - Vote: All in favor; no opposition; no abstentions.
  - Outcome: Motion carried.

Action Items:

- Elections and Procedures Committee to revise referral:
  - Specify time base for part-time lecturers (e.g., .5).
  - Identify exact constitutional section and policy changes.
  - Clearly state eligibility language for Senate elections.

Additional Discussion:

- Question from Senator Gerd Welke:
  - Asked whether the referral affects regular Senate seat assignment by college.
  - Vice Chair Barding clarified:
    - No changes to reapportionment; the referral only opens eligibility to part-time lecturers in the same way full-time lecturers are currently included.
    - Confirmed that previous reapportionment calculations were skipped when full-time lecturers were added because adjustments would have significantly shifted representation.

Action Items:

- Elections and Procedures Committee to revise referral with clarifications:
    - Define part-time work as .5-time base.
    - Identify constitutional section and policy changes.
    - Clearly state eligibility language for Senate elections.

Senator Kumar motioned to send the referral to committee. Senator Shen second.

M/s/p to send EP-001-256 to the Elections and Procedures Committee with recommendations.

Senator Quinn motioned to consolidate GE-022-256 through GE-024-256 and GE-026-256 through GE-028-256. Senator Edens second.

GE-022-256   HRT 2010 - Sustainable Tourism (New GE Area 4A) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

GE-023-256   HRT 4150 – International Tourism and the Global Community (New GE Area 4C) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

GE-024-256   HRT 4220 – Casino Management Seminar (New GE Area 4C) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

GE-026-256   KIN 3700 – Stress Management: The Science of Living Well (New GE Area 5D) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

GE-027-256   KIN 3800 – Healthy Lives, Scientific Minds: Science, Technology, and Human Well-Being (New GE Area 5D) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

GE-028-256   NTR 2030 – Health, Nutrition and the Integrated Being (New GE Area 4A) - REFERRAL

There was no discussion.

Senator Quinn motioned to send the GE referrals to committee, Senator Barding second.

M/s/p to send GE-022-256 through GE-024-256 and GE-026-256 through GE-028-256 to the General Education Committee.

4) Reports

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

AA-002-256   Online Courses with In-Person Exams – FIRST READING

- Purpose:
  - Propose a new instructional format allowing in-person exams for online courses, including the possibility of in-person final exams.
  - Current course modalities (Hybrid, HyFlex, Fully Online Synchronous/Asynchronous) do not permit in-person components under existing definitions.

---

2. Rationale for Referral

- Academic Integrity Concerns:
  - Significant cheating observed in online exams, particularly in Psychology 3307 (Statistics).
  - Evidence includes:
    - Unusual increases in exam averages.
    - Students copying incorrect answers using formulas not taught in the course.
- Department Efforts to Mitigate Cheating:
  - Redesigning exams.
  - Imposing time limits on questions.
  - Despite these efforts, new technologies have made cheating easier and harder to detect.

---

3. Challenges Identified

- Current Modalities Limit Options:
  - Hybrid requires 50% in-person instruction.
  - HyFlex has its own requirements.
  - Fully online courses cannot include in-person components.
- Faculty Workload:

- o Continuous redesign of assignments and exams to maintain integrity is time-consuming.
- o Department seeks an alternative modality to reduce faculty burden while maintaining academic standards.

---

4. Proposed Solution

- Create an instructional format that:
    - o Allow online courses to include in-person exams or final assessments.
    - o Provides flexibility without requiring full hybrid or HyFlex compliance.

---

5. Discussion

- Referral aims to balance academic integrity with faculty workload.
- Recognizes that pedagogical changes alone may not fully address cheating concerns.

---

6. Next Steps

- Forward referral to the appropriate committee for review and development of policy language.
- Committee to consider:
    - o Definition of the new modality.
    - o Guidelines for scheduling and student notification.
    - o Accessibility and equity implications for students.

7. Committee Outreach & Feedback

- The committee reached out to multiple campus offices for input.
- Feedback Summary:
    - o Responses were mixed, with significant concerns raised about accessibility and equity.

---

8. Key Concerns Identified

- Accessibility Issues:
    - o Requiring in-person exams for fully online courses could create barriers for students with disabilities.

- o Disability Resource Center (DRC) indicated this would exacerbate accommodation challenges.
- Equity Concerns:
    - o Students who enroll in online courses expecting remote flexibility may face hardships if in-person exams are required.
    - o Importance of clear communication at registration to avoid surprises.
- Space & Proctoring Challenges:
    - o Raised by Dr. Chavez, Dr. Reyes, and Dr. Santiago Gonzalez:
        - ▪ Large-scale proctoring needs exceed current DRC capacity.
        - ▪ Testing centers are not equipped for general proctoring beyond accommodation services.
        - ▪ Limited availability of approved spaces for exams.

---

9. Implications

- Any policy change must:
    - o Address physical space limitations.
    - o Ensure advance notice to students during registration.
    - o Consider DRC capacity and compliance with ADA requirements.

---

10. Next Steps

- Committee will:
    - o Continue gathering feedback from stakeholders.
    - o Explore solutions for space and proctoring logistics.
    - o Draft policy language includes clear communication requirements and equity safeguards.

11. Additional Accessibility Concerns

- ADA Compliance & DRC Capacity:
    - o Providing ADA-accessible spaces for in-person exams would be a significant challenge.
    - o Most students registered with the DRC request accommodation in specific formats, which may not align with in-person testing.
    - o There may be additional accessibility issues not fully identified yet, requiring further consultation.

---

12. Academic Integrity Trends

- Committee gathered data on faculty reporting of academic misconduct:
  - No meaningful increase in reported cases overall.
  - Most reported cases involve:
    - Plagiarism
    - Unauthorized collaboration
    - Improper use of AI tools
- Indicates that while cheating concerns exist, they are not reflected in formal reporting trends.

---

13. Student Modality Preferences

- According to feedback from Dr. Reyes (DRC):
  - Student requests for remote attendance options are increasing.
  - Introducing in-person exams for online courses may conflict with these preferences and expectations.

---

14. Equity & Impact

- Benefits of in-person exams appear to primarily address faculty concerns about academic integrity and workload.
- Committee noted potential student disenfranchisement, particularly related to:
  - Accessibility barriers.
  - Equity issues for students who choose online courses for flexibility.

---

15. Summary of Risks

- Introducing this option without clear safeguards could:
  - Create ADA compliance challenges.
  - Increase student dissatisfaction and equity gaps.
  - Require significant logistical planning for space and proctoring.

Next Steps

- Committee will:
  - Continue stakeholder consultations (DRC, Registrar, Academic Affairs).
  - Assess feasibility of ADA-compliant proctoring spaces.
  - Draft policy language that includes:
    - Advance disclosure at registration

- ▪ Accessibility accommodations
- ▪ Clear guidelines for implementation

16. Committee Position

- After extensive discussion and review of feedback:
  - o Committee voted on the referral and found the result perfectly split between support and opposition.
- Reason for Split:
  - o Complexity of weighing benefits (academic integrity, faculty workload relief) against concerns (accessibility, equity, logistics).
- Consensus Among Both Sides:
  - o Accessibility must be addressed in any implementation.
  - o Clear communication with students at registration is essential.

---

17. Recommendations

- Include clarifying language in the referral to:
  - o Inform students about any required in-person meetings or exams before enrollment.
- Authors should:
  - o Either revise an existing modality to include this option with clear guidelines, or
  - o Create a new modality that parallels current definitions but allows for in-person exams in online courses.

---

18. External Models

- Referral includes examples from other institutions:
  - o UC Berkeley: Online summer courses requiring in-person final exams.
  - o University of Florida and Brooklyn College: Similar models offering in-person assessments for online courses.
- These examples demonstrate feasibility but require strong communication and planning.

---

14. Next Steps

- Committee will forward the referral with recommendations for:
  - o Clarifying language on student notification.
  - o Consideration of accessibility and equity safeguards.

      ○   Evaluation of space and proctoring logistics.

15. Comparative Practices

- University of Florida:
  - Offers an online modality classified as 80–99% online, allowing limited in-person components.
- Brooklyn College:
  - Includes online asynchronous and synchronous courses that require an in-person final exam.
- CSU System:
  - No clear examples found of similar practices within CSU campuses.

---

16. Discussion on Demographics

- Senator Dennis Quinn:
  - Noted demographic differences between institutions, suggesting comparisons may be "apples and oranges."
- Senator Roy:
  - Highlighted that Brooklyn College shares similarities with CPP as a public, state institution with majority-minority demographics, making its model relevant for consideration.

---

17. Accessibility & Equity Concerns (Expanded)

- Senator Roy elaborated:
  - Many students choose online courses due to:
    - Distance from campus
    - Disability-related or medical needs
  - Introducing an in-person exam requirement could:
    - Create barriers for students with disabilities
    - Increase accommodation requests
    - Disrupt established access needs and potentially exacerbate medical conditions
  - DRC students registering for online courses expect remote accessibility; adding in-person requirements may hinder full participation.

---

18. Key Takeaways

- While other institutions have implemented similar models, CPP must:

- o Consider student demographics and needs
- o Address accessibility and equity implications
- o Ensure clear communication at registration if in-person exams become part of an online course modality.

Next Steps

- Committee will:
  - o Continue research on comparable models and best practices.
  - o Draft potential policy language with equity safeguards.
  - o Consult with DRC and other stakeholders to mitigate accessibility challenges.

15. Additional Concerns

- Senator Jeff Roy:
  - o Main concern: Online courses typically lack pre-established times and locations for in-person sessions.
  - o Introducing in-person exams without clear scheduling could create confusion and logistical challenges.
- Chair Hanink:
  - o Asked if setting times and locations at registration would resolve concerns.
- Senator Roy Response:
  - o While advanced communication would help, concerns remain:
    - Accessibility issues may persist even with pre-scheduled exams.
    - Space availability for DRC-approved classrooms is limited.
    - Campus space constraints could complicate implementation.

---

16. Committee Perspective

- Committee acknowledges:
  - o Communication of exam times and locations at registration is essential.
  - o However, unresolved issues include:
    - Space limitations
    - Ensuring ADA compliance
    - Managing equity for remote students

---

17. Proposed Next Step: Pilot Program

- Chair Hanink suggested:
  - o Consider a pilot program before creating a new modality.

- o Precedent exists (e.g., HyFlex pilot).
- o Would require engagement with Dr. Laura Massa and Academic Affairs.
- Supporting Information:
  - o ASCSU (2016) recommended a modality called "Local Online":
    - ▪ Instructions occur online.
    - ▪ Scheduled face-to-face meetings may be required for orientation or student evaluation.
  - o This could serve as a model for CPP.

---

18. Broader Context

- Senator Roy noted plagiarism concerns in online and HyFlex courses:
  - o Detection is difficult, but academic integrity issues are significant.
  - o In-person evaluations may help mitigate these challenges.

Next Steps

- Explore feasibility of a pilot program for online courses with in-person exams.
- Review ASCSU recommendations for Local Online modality.
- Engage stakeholders (Academic Affairs, DRC, Scheduling) to address:
  - o Space and accessibility requirements.
  - o Communication protocols for registration.
- Continue committee discussion and draft referral language.

19. Academic Integrity Concerns

- Senator Roy shared an example:
  - o A student's performance drastically improved in 20 days during online testing, raising concerns about cheating and authenticity of assessments.
- Key Point:
  - o Current online assessments may not accurately reflect student learning.
  - o Integrity issues could undermine academic standards and degree credibility.

---

20. Suggested Approach

- Senator Ghada Gad proposed:
  - o Use a clear designation (e.g., "Local Online") to communicate in-person requirements upfront.
  - o Ensure students know expectations at registration to plan accordingly.

- o Faculty should maintain academic integrity while balancing accessibility and equity.

---

21. Policy Considerations

- HyFlex currently allows up to 25% in-person meetings.
- Fully online asynchronous courses have no built-in in-person requirement, so adding one would require a policy change.
- Chair Hanink suggested:
    - o Start with a pilot program instead of immediate policy overhaul.
    - o Pilot could focus on final exams only, as this is easier to implement and less disruptive to scheduling.

---

22. Student Impact

- If in-person dates are not clearly communicated:
    - o Students may face schedule conflicts with other classes.
    - o Could limit enrollment options for those relying on fully online flexibility.

---

23. Committee Recommendation

- Chair Hanink recommended:
    - o Table the referral for now.
    - o Ask the AA Committee to:
        - ▪ Work with AVP Laura Massa and relevant offices to develop pilot parameters.
        - ▪ Report back with findings and recommendations.
- Pilot parameters should include:
    - o Scope (e.g., final exams only).
    - o Communication requirements.
    - o Accessibility and space considerations.

Next Steps

- Referral will not move to Senate at this time.
- AA Committee to:
    - o Collaborate with Academic Affairs and ECE.
    - o Develop pilot framework and parameters.

- o Address space, accessibility, and communication issues.
- o Report back before considering a full policy change.

24. Committee Agreement

- Senator Jeff Roy:
  - o Confirmed the committee can work on designing a pilot program with defined parameters.
  - o Suggested the pilot could focus on in-person final exams for fully online courses as a starting point.
  - o Will report back to the Executive Committee after developing the framework.

25. Pilot Program Considerations

- Chair Hanink:
  - o Clarified the committee's charge:
    - ▪ Design the pilot in collaboration with AVP Laura Massa and Academic Affairs.
    - ▪ Keep the referral tabled until pilot results are available.
  - o Emphasized that the pilot should:
    - ▪ Address space constraints and DRC accommodation needs.
    - ▪ Test feasibility for final exam-only model first.
    - ▪ Include parameters such as:
      - ▪ Class size limits (e.g., large lectures vs. smaller sections).
      - ▪ Communication requirements for students at registration.
      - ▪ Accessibility compliance and proctoring logistics.

26. Space and Accessibility Issues

- Senator Roy noted:
  - o Space is the biggest challenge, especially for large online classes (some with 200+ students).
  - o CPP has only 16 large lecture halls seating above 72 students.
  - o Pilot must determine:
    - ▪ Which class sizes are practical for in-person exams?
    - ▪ Impact on DRC resources during finals week.
- Senator Gerd Welke:
  - o Observed that DRC already experiences high demand during finals for hybrid classes.
  - o Uncertainty remains about how much additional demand this pilot would create.

27. CSU Context

- ASCSU's "Local Online" modality (2016) could serve as a model:
    - o Online instruction with scheduled face-to-face meetings for orientation or evaluation.
- This designation was recommended systemwide but not widely adopted by CSU campuses.

28. Next Steps

- Action Items:
    - o AA Committee to:
        - Collaborate with AVP Laura Massa and ECE to design pilot parameters.
        - Focus on final exam-only model for feasibility.
        - Address space, accessibility, and communication issues.
        - Report back to the Executive Committee with recommendations.
- Referral remains tabled until pilot results are reviewed.

29. Data Collection for Pilot Design

- Chair Hanink:
    - o Emphasized the need for data-driven decisions before implementing a pilot.
    - o Suggested gathering:
        - Percentage of students in online asynchronous courses who request DRC accommodation.
        - How many of these students are exclusively online versus already attending in-person classes.
    - o This data will clarify whether accessibility concerns are significant or overstated.

30. Flex Agreements

- Senator Gad raised concerns about DRC Flex Agreements:
    - o Students can request accommodations directly from instructors.
    - o Instructors have two weeks to respond.
    - o Example: Student requested five excused absences and seven days to make up work, which is problematic for lab-based courses.

- Question posed:
  - Are similar accommodations being requested for online courses under these agreements?
  - If so, this could complicate implementation of in-person exam requirements.

---

31. Committee Charge

- Senator Jeff Roy confirmed:
  - Committee will design pilot parameters and report back.
  - Pilot likely focused on final exam-only model for feasibility.
- Chair Hanink clarified:
  - Committee should design and propose implementation framework, not immediately implement.
  - Work with AVP Laura Massa and Academic Affairs to:
    - Define scope (class sizes, exam type).
    - Address space and accessibility issues.
    - Establish communication protocols for students at registration.

---

32. Key Questions for Pilot

- What size classes are feasible for in-person exams?
- How many large lecture spaces are available (currently 16 rooms seating 72+ students)?
- What is the impact on DRC capacity during finals week?
- How many online students currently request accommodations?
- How many are fully online versus hybrid or mixed enrollment?

---

33. Next Steps

- Action Items:
  - Senator Jeff Roy to:
    - Gather data from DRC on accommodation requests for online courses.
    - Determine percentage of students exclusively online.
  - AA Committee to:
    - Collaborate with Laura Massa to design pilot framework.
    - Include parameters for space, accessibility, and communication.
    - Report back to EC before moving forward.
- Referral remains tabled until pilot design and data review are complete.

34. Clarification on Pilot Scope

- Chair Hanink:
  - Clarified that the pilot should be designed and implemented, not just conceptualized.
  - Senate involvement ensures shared governance in the design phase.
  - Implementation would be handled by Academic Affairs (e.g., AVP Laura Massa) in collaboration with faculty.
  - Example: Pilot could start with Psychology 3307 and report back on outcomes.

---

35. Faculty Interest

- Senator Julie Shen:
  - Noted multiple faculty members expressed interest:
    - Dr. Hyun Kyung-Yoon (Assistant Professor, Math)
    - Dr. Zhang Wang Meng (Full Professor, Math)
  - Suggests strong cross-departmental interest in participating in a pilot program.

---

36. Pilot Design Considerations

- Pilot should:
  - Focus on final exam-only model for feasibility.
  - Include parameters for class size, accessibility, and space allocation.
  - Engage Cathay (HyFlex pilot experience) for insights.
  - Ensure clear communication with students at registration.
- Referral will be informationally forwarded to Jeff for committee work, not sent to Senate for action yet.

---

37. Timeline

- Earliest possible pilot starts: Fall 2026.
- Committee will:
  - Design pilot framework.
  - Coordinate with Academic Affairs and DRC.
  - Report back to EC with findings before any policy change.

---

38. Additional Data Needs

- Committee to collect:

- o   Percentage of online students requesting DRC accommodations.
- o   How many are fully online versus mixed enrollment?
- o   Impact of Flex Agreements on accommodation trends.
- Data will inform pilot feasibility and resource planning.

Next Steps

- Action Items:
    - o   Senator Jeff Roy will gather DRC data and coordinate with AVP Laura Massa.
    - o   AA Committee to design pilot parameters and gather HyFlex insights.
    - o   Report back to the Executive Committee with pilot design and timeline.
- Referral remains tabled until pilot results and data review are complete.

Timeline and Reporting

- Senator Gerd Welke: Asked if it will be explicit that the pilot results come back to the committee.
- Chair Hanink:
    - o   Clarified that while the pilot may not require formal Senate approval, the committee will report back with findings.
    - o   Suggested earliest implementation could be Fall 2026, though Spring 2026 may be possible if departments can adjust schedules.
    - o   Psychology could potentially run a tentative section and open it during transfer orientation if feasible.

Faculty Engagement

- Faculty who submitted the referral (Psychology) and interested Math faculty will be consulted:
    - o   Dr. Hyun Kyung-Yoon (Assistant Professor, Math)
    - o   Dr. Zhang Wang Meng (Full Professor, Math)
- Chair Hanink noted Math may have flexibility due to seat adjustments after finals and high DFW rates in some courses.

Committee Recap of Action Items

- Senator Jeff Roy to:
    - o   Contact DRC for data on accommodation requests in asynchronous courses.
        - ▪   Compare with face-to-face and hybrid courses.

- - Reach out to Kevin Autry and AVP Laura Massa to assess feasibility for a pilot in Spring or Fall.
  - Include Math faculty in discussions.
- Committee to:
  - Define pilot parameters (class size, accessibility, communication).
  - Gather HyFlex pilot insights.
  - Report back to the Executive Committee with design and timeline.

Pilot Design

- Pilot will:
  - Focus on final exam-only model for feasibility.
  - Include clear student communication at registration.
  - Address space limitations and DRC capacity.
- Implementation:
  - Academic Affairs will coordinate logistics.
  - Faculty will run pilot sections and provide feedback.
- Reporting:
  - Committee will deliver a formal report to EC on pilot outcomes and recommendations for broader rollout.

Next Steps

- Referral remains tabled until:
  - Pilot design completed.
  - Data collected from DRC.
  - Feasibility confirmed by Academic Affairs.
- Target timeline:
  - Spring 2026 if feasible, otherwise Fall 2026.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to table referral. Senator Shen second.

M/s/p to table AA-002-256.

AA-003-256   Academic Calendar with 5-Year Projection – FIRST READING

Discussion Summary:

- Senator Jeff Roy reported on updates regarding the academic calendar and its five-year projection:

- o Met with Phyllis Nelson on October 31, 2025, to review proposed changes.
  - o Key Change: Introduction of three registration blocks and associated fee due dates:
    - Block 1: Continuing students (scheduled first).
    - Block 2: Incoming students.
    - Block 3: Students who pay using the "Pay Now" button on registration day (often due to missed deadlines or financial aid status).
  - o Committee encouraged to monitor these changes during review.
- Follow-up Meeting:
  - o On November 12, Dr. Nelson attended the committee meeting to address questions and review edits submitted by Senator Roy.
  - o Minor edits were incorporated, and additional clarifications were provided.
- Outstanding Issue:
  - o Use of Columbus Day in the current CPP calendar versus recognition of Indigenous Peoples Day.
    - Indigenous Peoples Day is recognized statewide by the Governor's proclamation and by the CSU Chancellor's Office.
    - Many CSU campuses (e.g., Northridge, San Francisco, Fullerton, Sacramento State, San Diego State) include Indigenous Peoples Day as a movable holiday during fall or winter breaks.
    - This issue has surfaced repeatedly in past reviews; previous referral noted in 2018 (authored by Senator Faye Wachs).
  - o Committee discussed the need for alignment with CSU practices and state recognition.
- Next Steps:
  - o Dr. Nelson provided updated responses and minor edits; these were included in the submission package.
  - o Committee to continue monitoring holiday designation and registration block implementation in future calendar reviews.

Additional Discussion:

- Senator Jeff Roy noted that:
  - o Questions and suggestions for minor edits were highlighted in blue in the submitted document.
  - o Overall, the committee found the calendars acceptable after review.
- Motion:
  - o Vice Chair Barding moved to send the academic calendar to the Senate floor.
  - o Motion was seconded by Senator Gad.
  - o Vote: All in favor; no opposition; no abstentions.
  - o Outcome: Motion carried.
- First Reading Waiver:
  - o Senator Kumar confirmed the calendar will require a first reading waiver because it must be approved by the Senate this semester.
  - o Senator Roy explained that Dr. Phyllis Nelson acknowledged the late submission and apologized.

- o Given the absence of major issues, the committee agreed to proceed with the waiver.
- Future Improvements:
  - o Chair Hanink suggested starting the calendar approval process earlier in spring to avoid recurring delays.
  - o Senator Roy raised concerns about the PDF format being difficult to review and annotate.
    - ▪ Committee requested alternative formats (e.g., Excel), but Phyllis noted challenges with Excel and has not found a suitable solution yet.
    - ▪ Dr. Phyllis Nelson indicated that responsibility for calendar preparation will be transitioned to another individual in the future.
- Closing Remarks:
  - o Chair Hanink thanked Senator Roy for his work.
  - o Senator Roy expressed interest in continuing the discussion on Indigenous Peoples Day recognition in future calendar revisions.

Action Items:

- Forward academic calendar to Senate floor with first reading waiver.
- Explore earlier timeline for calendar review starting in spring.
- Investigate alternative formats for calendar review (beyond PDF).
- Consider future referral regarding Indigenous Peoples Day inclusion.

Vice Chair Barding motioned to send the report to the Senate Meeting Agenda. Senator Gad second.

M/s/p to send AA-003-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for December 3, 2025.

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

AP-015-245   Liberal Studies, B.A. – General Studies Option name Change – FIRST READING

There was no discussion.

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

M/s/p to send AP-015-245 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for December 3,

2025.

AP-016-245 Liberal Studies, B.A. – Pre-Credential Option Name Change – FIRST
READING

Discussion Summary:

- Senator Mohammad Husain presented a proposal from the Liberal Studies
Department to change the name of its pre-credential option to:
Elementary Education Pre-Credential.
- Rationale for Change:
  - The original name caused confusion with programs in the Early Childhood
Studies (ECS) department.
  - The new name aims to clarify pathways for prospective students.
- Consultation Issues:
  - No intra-college consultation occurred before submission.
  - At the Academic Programs Committee level, it was discovered that ECS had
not been consulted, leading to concerns.
  - The Associate Dean facilitated discussions between departments (Dean was
on bereavement leave).
  - After multiple meetings, a compromise was reached:
    - Liberal Studies will append "K-8" to the name.
    - ECS, when proposing its pre-credential program, may append "PK-3".
    - Neither department will use "Elementary Education" as a standalone
name; grade levels must be included for clarity.
- Final Recommendation:
  - Approve the modified name:
Elementary Education (K-8) Pre-Credential Option.
  - Work with Office of Academic Programs (Ashley Ly) to update Curriculog
and finalize the change.
- Additional Notes:
  - Chair Hanink identified a typo in the background paragraph ("P through 3rd"
should be "PK through 3rd").
  - Correction confirmed by Senator Mohammad Husain.
- Motion:
  - Senator Julie Shen moved to approve the recommendation with modifications.
  - Motion seconded by Vice Chair Barding.

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

M/s/p to send AP-016-245 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for December 3,
2025.

AP-001-256   Program Review BA and MA English – FIRST READING

There was no discussion.

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

M/s/p to send AP-001-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for December 3, 2025.

AP-003-256   Program Review BS Physics – FIRST READING

There was no discussion.

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

M/s/p to send AP-003-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for December 3, 2025.

AP-004-256   Academic Credit Certificate Programs Update (Revised) - SECOND
               READING

Acknowledgment:

- Chair Hanink expressed appreciation to Senator Mohammad Husain for his extensive work and collaboration with AVP Laura Massa regarding the referral under discussion.
  - Noted that the process involved significant back-and-forth and consumed a considerable amount of Mohammad's time.
  - Publicly thanked Mohammad for his effort and dedication.
- Senator Julie Shen commented on being impressed with previous reports and acknowledged that this referral appears to require even more attention.
- Senator Mohammad Husain responded: "No problem."

Discussion Summary:

- Senator Mohammad Husain provided an update following the first reading of the referral:
  - Questions Raised:
    - Faculty from the College of Business Administration (CBA) asked whether CPGE would still offer self-support degree programs if financial aid availability becomes limited.

- - - Response from Office of Academic Programs:
        - Financial aid restrictions apply only to non-degree programs (e.g., certificates).
        - Full degree programs under CPGE remain unaffected.
  - Follow-up Question:
    - If a self-support degree program includes a certificate option, would financial aid cover the certificate?
    - Clarification:
      - Standalone certificates are not eligible for financial aid.
      - If certificate coursework (e.g., 9 units) falls within the degree program's financial aid limits, it might be covered.
      - However, the Financial Aid Office advises against offering certificates within self-support programs due to potential student confusion.
      - Senator Husain will seek further clarification from AVP Laura Massa to ensure clear guidance for faculty.
  - Additional Context from Senate Floor:
    - AVP Laura Massa explained that students previously withdrew after learning certificates were not eligible for financial aid.
    - In subsequent years, no applications were submitted once this was clarified.
- Committee Recommendation:
  - Senator Husain confirmed the committee recommends moving forward with the second reading.
  - Emphasized that keeping academic certificates on the state-support side is in the university's best interest to avoid compliance issues with federal financial aid regulations.
  - Highlighted risks if students enroll in self-support degree programs, complete certificate requirements, and then withdraw from the degree program— potentially requiring the university to return financial aid funds.
  - Shared that federal requirements for certificates to qualify for aid are extensive (e.g., two-year offering, gainful employment metrics, salary thresholds).
  - Administration has been thorough in addressing these concerns.
- Acknowledgment:
  - Chair Hanink thanked Senator Husain for his detailed work and engagement with CBA faculty.

Action Items:

- Senator Husain to seek additional clarification from AVP Laura Massa regarding certificate eligibility under self-support programs.
- Proceed with second reading as recommended by the committee.

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

M/s/p to send AP-004-256 to the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for December 3, 2025.

5) Old Business

   No old business.

6) New Business

   Policy 1391 - Subcommittee Formation for Faculty Emeritus Appeal

   1. Background

   - A faculty member has retired and appealed the denial of the request for emeritus status.
   - The department declined granting emeritus status.
   - Faculty Affairs, consulted with Dr. Cheryl Koos, confirmed there are reasons for the denial that the department can explain.

   ---

   2. Discussion Points

   - Next Steps:
     - Schedule meetings with:
       - The faculty member (via Zoom).
       - The department (optional attendance; invitation will be extended).
   - Committee Structure:
     - Decision needed on whether to handle as:
       - Full committee during Executive Committee meetings, or
       - A subcommittee.
     - Vice Chair Barding volunteered to lead the process, given prior experience with appeals.
   - Process Outline:
     - Subcommittee will:
       - Hear both sides (the faculty member and department).
       - Make a recommendation:
         - Uphold the appeal and forward to the President for consideration, or
         - Support the department's decision.
     - If appeal is denied, the faculty member retains the right to escalate to the President.
   - Neutrality:
     - No assumptions or bias; committee acts as a neutral body.

- o No egregious issues reported.
- Impact of Emeritus Status:
  - o Primarily symbolic and includes minor benefits (parking, library, email privileges).
  - o Acknowledged personal significance for the faculty member's years of service.

---

3. Action Items

- Decide on committee approach (full committee vs. subcommittee).
- Greg to coordinate scheduling:
  - o Zoom meeting with Dr. Merlino.
  - o Optional meeting with department representatives.
- Prepare a recommendation after hearings.

Tentative Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for December 3, 2025.

Agenda Overview

- Reviewed the tentative agenda for the Academic Senate meeting scheduled for December 3, 2025.

---

2. Key Discussion Points

- AP Committee Report:
  - o Will be included for second reading.
  - o Previously removed from the agenda pending discussion with the Executive Committee; the AP report will now be added back to the agenda.
- Other Items:
  - o Confirmed inclusion of first readings based on current updates.
  - o Additional reports and statistical updates will also be added.
- Time Certain Adjustment:
  - o Current time certain is 4:30 PM, but earlier agenda items may not take as long.
  - o Suggested moving time certain earlier to avoid long breaks.
  - o Action: Check with Desiree Martinez regarding availability for an earlier time certain (possibly 4:15 PM).
- Agenda Approval:
  - o Motion to approve the tentative agenda was made and seconded.
  - o Motion carried unanimously.

3. Action Items

- Add AP Committee Report back to the agenda.
- Include first readings and other reports as discussed.
- Email Desiree Martinez to confirm if she can attend earlier (around 4:15 PM).
- Finalize and distribute updated agenda.

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

M/s/p to approve the Academic Senate Meeting Agenda for December 3, 2025.

7) Discussion

There was no additional discussion.

Adjourned @ 5:01 PM