Preparatory: the meeting was opened at 3:13pm.

I. Minutes: none.

II. Communications and Announcements:
The agenda was reordered to include President Baker in its discussion.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President's Office:
C. Provost’s Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. Staff Council Representative:
G. ASI Representative:
H. Other:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
I. Resolution on the Academic Value of Diversity: first reading. The resolution was advanced to second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting.

J. Resolution on Cal Poly’s Diversity Statement: first reading. The resolution was advanced to second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting.

Election of officers for the 1998-1999 term: Myron Hood was elected Chair of the Academic Senate for the 1998-1999 term.

K. Resolution on General Education 2000: first reading. Comments made by Professor R. Gish are attached to these minutes. The resolution was advanced to second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting.

G. Resolution on Experimental Courses: first reading. (May 21, 1998 version.) The resolution was advanced to second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting.

H. Resolution on Departure from University Grading Policy: first reading. The resolution was advanced to second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:00pm.

Submitted by:

Margaret Camuso
Academic Senate
“I trust I’m not whistling in the dark here and that recommendations are welcome. I hope that is indeed the case. I’m concerned that the version of GE Criteria before us does not explicitly state the importance of diversity generally, of gender issues, and of ethnic diversity more particularly; nor is the version before us reflective of a modicum of multicultural values and assumptions about (1) communication, (2) arts and humanities, and (3) social sciences. Pages 3, 4, 5, 6 of the document equivocate and qualify, allowing great latitude to interpretations and values of any given GE Governing Board. Moreover, terms are shifted with too much ease and are not adequately defined—allowing for shifting definitions as well.

Phrases like ‘will not ordinarily,’ ‘where relevant to the material,’ and ‘in appropriate ways,’ AND terms like ‘ethnicity and diversity’ (as if separate from each other) and ‘intellectual diversity’ (as if separate from ethnic diversity) are open to wide interpretation by any given governing board. The emphasis on phrases like ‘western intellectual tradition’ (p. 6) and ‘particularly western culture’ (p. 4), is particularly divisive and troubling to me, especially where little to no mention is made of terms such as ‘multiculturalism.’ The assumption that USCP is a requirement with separate criteria from GE criteria allows for much exclusion of USCP kinds of courses, depending, again, on the interpretations and applications of the GE Governing Board. Pages 6, 10, 12, 14 and the respective area 'cover paragraphs,’ do not relate in any obvious or explicit way to the opening generalizations of high-principled intent, most particularly in relation to diversity and gender. And a phrase like ‘cultural achievements’ (p. 10) might easily be read as ‘high culture’ or ‘particularly western culture’ stated on page 4. In sum, I fear a dedication to the realities of our multicultural state is not manifested in either letter or spirit in this version of the document and would plead for more explicit language fostering multicultural as well as mono-cultural (Anglo-European) values, the dominant values of the present curriculum. Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.”