Preparatory: The meeting was opened at 3:10 p.m.


I. Minutes:

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

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: no report
   B. President’s Office: no report
   C. Provost’s Office:
   D. Statewide Senators: Gooden reported that he is gathering materials on the issue of the Baccalaureate, and is trying to set up a meeting for the Monterey conference attendees to discuss same. Greenwald queried if Tuesday, 2/4/97 would be a good date. Academic Senate office could reproduce any materials for the meeting. The Cornerstones Initiative was also discussed, including undergraduate and graduate education, access, funding and accountability. Hale reported that the Expectations statement has been approved. At the state-wide level, a resolution has been passed to evaluate the PSSI process. A task force has been established to evaluate the process and make recommendations to the Chancellor. Finally, the CSU Annual Report is now available for review.
   E. CFA Campus President: Zetzsche reported that he will be writing a letter to Chancellor Munitz expressing displeasure in the PSSI process. CFA will be taking a stand. The CFA presidents have moved that the faculty should go on strike if the PSSI process is not done away with. Amspacher questioned the status of campus review of the PSSI process. Greenwald reported that the Faculty Affairs committee and college PSSI committee chairs will meet in mid-February. The group will look at the PSSI process, to try to create a more liveable situation for Cal Poly. Morrobel-Sosa questioned composition of the university PSSI committee. Discussion ensued on the pros and cons of the chair of the college PSSI committee serving on the university committee.
   F. Staff Council representative: no report
   G. ASI representative: Welch reported that the proposed GEB governance structure and template resolutions have been discussed.
   H. IACC representative: Bowker indicated that the Deans Council will meet on 2/3/97 and should make decisions on faculty workstations.
I. Athletics Governing Board representative: Brown reported that there was a meeting last week. The NCAA Convention tends to be quite democratic. However, the convention will be made more “business-like” next year. The Board has received a revised Sports Complex plan. The City of San Luis Obispo will have a budget meeting in February. Various groups are still working on certification documents.

J. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Academic Senate/university-wide vacancies: Mike Botwin was M/S/P to fill the vacancy for a senator from CAED. Chris Yip was M/S/P to fill the CAED vacancy on the U.S. Cultural Pluralism Subcommittee. Laura Freberg was M/S/P to complete the term previously held by David Grant on the Disabled Students Advisory Committee. Basil Fiorito was M/S/P to fill the vacancy on the Student Health Advisory Council. It was M/S/P to give conditional approval to appointing Doug Cerf as the CBUS representative to the Grants Review committee, pending caucus approval.

B. Selection of faculty to the Consultative Committee for the Selection of Dean for the College of Liberal Arts: Greenwald gave results of election. Concern was expressed over the lack of gender diversity on the committee. M/S/P to put Gilbert Cooke, Richard Saenz, George Cotkin, Richard Simon, Clifton Swanson, and Kendrick Walker forward as recommendations of the Academic Senate.

C. Resolution on Proposed Model of Unit Distribution for General Education and Breadth: Greenwald gave introduction. The first issue is the process of voting. The second issue is the timetable for voting on the resolutions. The third issue is agendizing this proposal.

Johnston relayed that he has received negative feedback on conflicting documents being sent ahead. Discussion ensued on pros and cons of sending mixed-message reports (committee report plus alternative reports). Hampsey indicated that the committee deliberated on all issues presented at the last meeting. Hampsey clarified why the integrity of the document should be maintained after two full years of discussion by the group. However, the committee still wants input from the Senate. Morrobel-Sosa reported that she received negative feedback about the timing of the document, and questioned the “rush” to vote on the process. She reiterated that there should be plenty of time for discussion. Morrobel-Sosa was concerned that the CENG felt that the college recommendations did not go forward to the ad hoc committee. Hampsey reported that all documents were considered. Also, he indicated that there “is no rush to judgement”, however, deadlines should be considered. The “best case scenario” would be to close this debate in April 1997, with possible new GEB model implemented in Fall 1999. Morrobel-Sosa voiced concern about voting on concept in the absence of detail, indicating that structure defines details. Miller reported that CBUS felt that the structure was pretty good, however another group wants to stop the proposal at all costs. Irvin reiterated that the committee did review all suggestions. Lutrin clarified that the change in representation came as a recommendation from the GEB committee. Lutrin also requested that the alternative reports be voted on before the committee report. Hampsey said that there is opportunity for curricular variations after the structure is in place.
Martinez urged the group to remember the students. Morrobel-Sosa replied that all curriculum is for the students, not just GEB. Greenwald expressed concern over changing the process now. Consistency is important.

**M/S/P (Gooden/Hampsey) to agendize Proposed Administrative Structure.** Greenwald confirmed that alternative reports will be voted on before the committee report. Lutrin felt that representation is the biggest issue. Greenwald proposed a special meeting on 3/6/97 to organize alternative reports.

Greenwald indicated that the 2nd reading of the Proposed Administrative Structure will take place on February 11th. Greenwald felt that it would not be advantageous to have both resolutions on the same agenda. The 1st reading for the Template resolution will take place on February 18th as a special continuation meeting, followed by a 2nd reading on March 11th. The Executive Committee meeting will be rescheduled. **M/S/P (Martinez/Hampsey) to accept dates as proposed.**

Gooden questioned the differences between the current areas and the proposed template areas. Lutrin requested clarification of “common core”. Hampsey gave examples. Miller asked where Cultural Pluralism fits in. Greenwald clarified differences between Cultural Pluralism and GEB. Computer literacy and Cultural Pluralism are local requirements - not directed by the Executive Order. Morrobel-Sosa questioned where Technical Writing is in the template. Irvin said it’s not in there, and that all GEB should have a writing component. **M/S/P (Bowker/Martinez) to agendize Template.**

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: **M/S/P to adjourn at 5:00 p.m.**
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