I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): none

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair: The Chair announced that IBM would be on campus this week to make presentations on the megaserver.
   B. President’s Office: none
   C. Vice President for Academic Affairs: none
   D. Statewide Senators: none
   E. CFA Campus President: none
   F. ASI representatives: none
   G. Michael Suess, Director of Faculty Affairs, gave the interview dates for the candidates interviewing for Director of Extended Education and Dean of Research and Graduate Programs.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
   A. Resolution on Academic Senate Recommendations for Accommodating Immediate Budget Reductions: A motion was M/S/P (Murphy/Mori) to table this item until the next Senate meeting.

The agenda was reordered to hear Business Items E, F, and G first.

E. Curriculum proposal for JOUR 318: This item was moved to a second reading item. M/S/P to approve the recommendation of the GE&B Committee.

F. Curriculum proposal for PHYS 211: This item was moved to a second reading item. M/S/P to approve the recommendation of the GE&B Committee.

G. Curriculum proposal for WS 411: This item was moved to a second reading item. M/S/P to approve the recommendation of the GE&B Committee.

B. Report of the Engineering Technology Discontinuance Committee: The Chair of the Engineering Technology (ET) Department, Kim Davis, gave some brief statements regarding the findings of the committee. The demand for ET students is high. There are only two ET programs in the CSU (San Luis Obispo and Pomona). All faculty possess a terminal degree for ET and all are licensed state engineers.

Harris asked if Professor Davis had any remarks to make about the unanimous decision of the CENG Dean and all the departments within the college to discontinue ET. Fred Friedman, a faculty member from ET, responded that the recommendations for improvement which were cited were already being addressed by ET at the time it was decided to defund the program. Davis indicated that the reason cited for identifying ET for discontinuing was that it was a vocational program. Davis strongly disagreed that ET was a vocational program. When other departments were asked for alternatives, they responded that they could not locate other “vocational” areas to eliminate. Harris asked about the statistical information regarding enrollments and number of majors. Fred Friedman responded that the enrollment patterns were the same for all departments within the College of Engineering. Dana asked what the terminal degree was for ET. Davis replied that in Engineering Technology, the Master’s Degree is the terminal degree.

The wording of the Resolution on ET and EET quotes recommendation #2 of the discontinuance report verbatim. This was misleading because it implied that the
administration was to make the choice whether to continue/discontinue these programs. (..."If the Administration chooses not to follow the above recommendation, then it is recommended that...")

It was agreed that the resolution would go back to the Executive Committee for its editing and would return to the Academic Senate as a second reading item.

D. Curriculum proposals: Bailey gave some background information on the deliberations of the Curriculum Committee during its review of programs. Priority was given to programs that wanted to decrease the number of units in its degree program to 186; programs that have created general degree programs as well as concentrations; and those which have provided more flexibility in electives.

The curriculum proposal for the BS in Computer Science came before the body as a first reading. It was M/S/P to move this item to a second reading. M/S/P to approve the Curriculum Committee recommendations for Computer Science.

The following curriculum proposals were heard, in the following order, as first reading items: College of Liberal Arts (WS 400), English, Music, Political Science, Speech Communication, UCTE, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, Statistics, and Psychology/Human Development.

Extended discussion ensued regarding the curriculum proposal for the Music Department. Since this is the first year that Music has had a major, several curriculum changes were made to fine tune the program as a major. A course proposed in Jazz Improvisation would require a part-time faculty member. Hanson asked about the budget implications of the curriculum changes. Carnegie responded that the department appears to have a high faculty workload. Russell replied that the new course proposals are courses which have been taught for the last twenty years but have been restructured in order to articulate the courses more fully. Murphy expressed concern about having faculty loads which are in violation of the M.O.U. Bailey suggested that other departments on campus have parallel conditions. Bailey requested that the Department Head, Clif Swanson, be invited to the second reading of this item in order to address the Senate's concerns.

A minor change was noted for Mathematics: 1.1. should be "approved" and 1.2. should be "disapproved."

Discussion was held regarding the proposal by the Psychology and Human Development Department to offer two separate degrees--one in Psychology and one in Human Development. This will give two different identities to these degree programs. Members of the Psychology & Human Development Department were present to answer questions. The Department Chair, Patrice Engle, stated that there has been strong student desire to have a Psychology program and it would take no new resources to create two separate degree programs; it simply streamlines and clarifies the program already in existence. Murphy remarked that there appeared to be a difference in opinion as to whether it would/wouldn't take more resources to create two programs. Carnegie responded that much of what was put into the Budget Committee's report was based on what was predicted to take place. The amount of courses offered in the Human Development program appear to be greater than the four faculty in that specialty could handle. Engle replied that the faculty in the department have the flexibility to teach in both areas and the Human Development program would be staffed in that way.

THIS MEETING WILL BE CONTINUED ON TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1993, TO COMPLETE THE MAY 18, 1993 AGENDA.

VI. Discussion: none

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm.

Recorded by:

Margaret Camuso, Academic Senate
Memorandum

To: Academic Senate Members

From: Ned Schultz, Curriculum Chair
Psychology & Human Development

Subj: Questions and Answers on the Psychology & Human Development Proposal

We would like to seek your support for the curriculum changes that we are proposing for 1994-1996. To help you review our proposals, here are some questions that have been asked about our proposals, along with information that we hope will answer any concerns you might have.

1. Why is it necessary to divide into two majors?

Our students who are interested in early childhood education and teaching-related careers need to focus on human development and related subject areas. Our students who want to work with agencies, businesses or organizations in a psychological career or who wish to go on to graduate school in psychology have significantly different needs. It has become very difficult to address these distinct interests, career orientations and graduate school aspirations in one major. So we propose to subdivide, to realign our existing majors and courses in two groups. Students and faculty will have the autonomy to focus their work more successfully with separate majors.

2. Why does the psychology major include an emphasis on developmental psychology, family psychology and social psychology?

The American Psychological Association has suggested that undergraduate majors in psychology have generalist and/or "thematic" emphases. Our proposal has a generalist emphasis in that students can take advisor approved electives that could come from many different disciplines. We also offer "themes" in developmental, family and social psychology because these are significant fields in psychology and because these are strengths of our faculty. Even in these concentrations students would take electives in related disciplines.

We do not have the resources to offer a traditional, "textbook" psychology major that would cover every subfield of our discipline. Hence we have focused on our strong areas. We also believe that these applied areas (represented by the existing concentrations) fit well with the applied emphasis that distinguishes Cal Poly's approach to education.

3. Is there broad support from the department's faculty and students for the proposals?

Over the past several years the faculty have debated the merits of a two major proposal. We have now come together in a nearly unanimous view that the current proposal is the best way to go. Our departmental vote (anonymous, written ballot) on the package was 17 to 1 in favor. Our students are quite excited about the prospect of a choice in majors. A survey of our current majors indicated that 19% would choose the new HD major, 67% would opt for the PSY major and 13% were undecided.

4. Do the proposed revisions increase the likelihood that students will graduate more quickly?

One of the best reasons for approving our proposals is that they reduce degree requirements in a way that should help students finish their undergraduate work in a more timely fashion. The degree total drops from 198 units to 186, a savings of perhaps a full quarter. The number of required major courses drops from 19 to 15 in PSY and 16 in HD. Senior project is reduced from 6 units total to 4 units. Considerable flexibility is added for all students in the form of advisor approved electives. We are confident that our students will complete their work more quickly if the proposed changes are adopted, compared to the larger current curriculum.
5. Can the department staff two majors without additional resources?

We are proposing a realignment of existing courses that are already staffed. Of the six new courses proposed, five of them (PSY 256, 419, 420, 461 & 462) are revisions of courses staffed in the current HD program. There is only one completely new course (PSY 457).

Because we are dropping four courses (HD 296, 298, 463 & 464), reducing our degree total requirements, and reducing sections of some courses (no longer required by one or the other of the two majors) the net WTU change is a reduction of 18 or more WTUs annually.

Most of our faculty will orient themselves primarily to the PSY major, but a core group is dedicated to Human Development. We also have a number of faculty with backgrounds and interests in psychology and human development who can work with both programs, as needed. We believe that this flexibility will support students in both majors.

6. Will G.E.B. course offerings be reduced?

Not at all. PSY 201/202 will continue to be offered as before. Our other G.E.B. course, PSY 304, has been budgeted for a 1 section increase (from 4 to 5 sections annually) to accommodate the increase in PSY majors who would be taking it.

7. Why doesn't the PSY major require more than one statistics course?

The APA guidelines which we used suggest including one statistics course, one research methods course and a course on psychometrics or individual differences. Our proposal meets these guidelines with a STAT requirement (which would go from 3 to 4 units when STAT 217 is approved as a regular course) and the PSY 329 methods course (expanded in our proposal from 3 to 5 units). Individual differences are addressed in the required courses, PSY 256 (Developmental Psychology) and PSY 305 (Personality) and in a number of elective PSY courses. Psychometrics are addressed specifically in the elective course, PSY 432 (Psychological Testing). We match or exceed other CSU and UC psychology undergraduate programs in these requirements. We also match or exceed the STAT requirement in all Cal Poly majors in Liberal Arts and such Science and Math majors as Biological Sciences, Ecology & Systematic Biology, Microbiology, Chemistry, Biochemistry, Physics and Physical Science.

8. How do we know you won't come back in another year or two and ask for more resources?

It is true that we are asking you, as our colleagues, to accept our good faith estimate of the WTUs required to run these majors. Ed Carnegie, of the Senate Budget Committee has confirmed that our proposal should lead to an 18.8 or so reduction in WTUs. Our dean, Harry Sharp, Jr., has also made it clear that we will not receive additional resources to implement these changes. And there is further reassurance on these estimates when you remember that we are reducing our degree totals from 198 to 186 units. The proposed HD and PSY majors are leaner. Should anyone ever claim that additional resources are required, it would be easy to point to the reductions in our 1994-96 curriculum.

9. Why change the programs now?

From the merger of the Child & Family Development Department and Psychology Department in 1984, when we committed to working toward two degrees, we have made gradual and steady progress in this direction. We've added concentrations in psychology. We developed a minor in psychology. A master's degree was moved to our department and became a master's in psychology. To us and especially to our students, the bachelor's degree in psychology is a logical and necessary additional step, as are the revisions to the human development program. These proposed curriculum changes can be made relatively easily even in times of budget constraints and restructuring. It is important to us not to become paralyzed by difficult times, but to move forward with a sensible, carefully-developed curriculum plan.
State of California

Memorandum

To : Jack Wilson, Chair
Academic Senate

From : P. J. Carnegie, Chair
Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject : Budget Implications from the English Department

Date : 19 May 1993

The English Department's proposal has some very interesting ramifications. The short term affects seem to be negative, requiring 4 to 5 more WTUs. Some of the courses have been offered for four years as "X" courses and therefore would impose no additional resources. The long term affect could be positive as they proposed an ESL (English as a Second Language) course, a 1-2 unit "umbrella" course and a 2-unit Tutorial course.

Cal Poly has a recruiter assigned to increasing the number of foreign students on campus because they pay full tuition. If this program is successful these students must become proficient in English if they are to survive. The ESL course would assist in retention of these students.

Cal Poly receives a number of transfer students who many times are short 1-2 units of English or Literature and are forced into taking a 3-4 unit course to meet the requirement. The "umbrella" course could then reduce the total number of WTUs required for those students.

The tutorial course was designed to prepare teaching assistants to be able to effectively teach freshman composition courses. Whether you agree with this or not it could reduce the cost.

The Budget Committee feels that the long term affect would be positive and recommends that the proposed changes move ahead.
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: E.J. Carnegie, Chair
       Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Budget Implications from the Speech Communication Proposal

The proposal is to replace one existing course with one new course. The Budget Committee sees no change in resource needs.
WHEREAS, ASI is the recognized spokesperson for the Cal Poly students; and

WHEREAS, The students at Cal Poly are the consumers of their education and have the right to educate themselves on what they are receiving for their money; and

WHEREAS, The Cal Poly student body has expressed a need and a desire for a student-teacher evaluation program; and

WHEREAS, ASI has conducted two pilot programs which have demonstrated the students' desire for this program; and

WHEREAS, The evaluations would be used for student purposes—as a means to "know" about their future professors; and

WHEREAS, ASI would like the help and support of the faculty in the coordinating process of the program; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That ASI and the Academic Senate create a joint task force of students and faculty to develop an evaluation instrument and method of implementation for the program; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That these so-named evaluations would not be used for tenure, promotion, or layoff of faculty members but be used solely for the benefit of educating the students about future professors and their teaching styles.

Proposed by ASI
May 20, 1993
SUBSTITUTE RESOLUTION FOR PAGE 12 OF YOUR MAY 18, 1993 AGENDA

Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
THE CALENDARING SYSTEM

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate receive accept the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Calendaring System and endorse its recommendations; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate make a formal recommendation on what calendar to adopt following discussions of the calendaring options by the Instruction Committee, Curriculum Committee, and the various charter campus committees. The recommendations will come forward no later than the beginning of the winter quarter, 1994.

Proposed By: Academic Senate Executive Committee
May 11, 1993
Revised May 20, 1993
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS- -93/
RESOLUTION ON
CHARTER CAMPUS FOR CAL POLY

Background: Due to the continuing erosion of fiscal support for higher education and the effect this has on Cal Poly's academic and support programs, consideration for restructuring the university as a charter campus is presently being investigated. A charter campus structure would allow Cal Poly more autonomy in governing its direction and resources. In view of the growing demands being placed on the state's universities, creative approaches are needed to resist the deleterious effects posed by decreasing state support and increasing state legislation. The ability of the university to respond to the fiscal crisis is restrained by the overly centralized, highly bureaucratic system under which it strives. As a charter campus, Cal Poly would remain a state-funded institution but would be relatively free from the bureaucratic constraints in the use of these funds.

WHEREAS, The unique nature of Cal Poly's academic programs and its reputation for distinctive teaching make it an appropriate campus to consider the special opportunities provided under a charter campus structure; and

WHEREAS, Cal Poly's self-design as a charter campus would allow it to enhance its excellent reputation by gaining greater control over the quality of its programs, develop new and innovative ways to promote more learning, and create less burden for its faculty and staff while increasing its enrollments to meet the growing needs of the state; and

WHEREAS, The desire to consider the benefits of a charter campus have been impeded by faculty concern regarding the manner in which such planning and committee selections to develop this concept have taken place; and

WHEREAS, Protection of existing employee rights and benefits has not been assured in the deliberations regarding charter campus; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That there be appropriate and substantial faculty involvement in addressing the desirability of assuming charter status, in the development of policies regarding employee relations, compensation structure, working conditions, benefits, protection of rights, collective bargaining options, as well as the development of the campus' mission statement and academic master plan as a charter campus; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That current employee rights and benefits remain in effect under a charter campus design; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the charter campus model developed for Cal Poly establish its own internal governance; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the minutes of all charter campus committees and task groups be sent on a timely basis to the Academic Senate for viewing by faculty; and, be it further
RESOLVED: That Cal Poly confer with the Academic Senate CSU in defining the concept of a charter campus throughout its deliberations; and, be it further

RESOLVED: That the decision to restructure Cal Poly to a charter campus be made only after a positive recommendation has been received from Cal Poly's Academic Senate; and, be it further

RESOLVED: If a positive recommendation has been received from the Academic Senate, that the final draft of the charter campus proposal for Cal Poly be submitted to a vote of the General Faculty and the vote be made on a section-by-section basis, each section requiring a majority of the votes before being sent to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees for approval.

RESOLVED: That nothing stated herein is intended to preclude discussions which would result in improvements of the stated resolutions.

Proposed By the Academic Senate
Executive Committee
May 20, 1993
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair
       Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Budget Implications from Music

The proposal from the Music Department indicates a net increase of 22.5 WTUs. They are planning to add 12 new courses and only dropping one. The table below shows the affect and the faculty utilization for the 1992-93 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Music Department</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>WTU Old</th>
<th>WTU New</th>
<th>WTU Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 121</td>
<td>M New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 186</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 210</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 211</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 212</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 251</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 259</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 261</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 262</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 263</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 302</td>
<td>M New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 303</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 386</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.5

Number of Faculty 8.5

SCU 8954

WTUs/Faculty 406.17

FTEF 47.78

SCU/FTEF 351.14

Part time 0.44

60

WTUs/Faculty 19.80

FTEF 45.00

SCU/FTEF 45.45

The faculty in the Music Department at this time is very heavily loaded. The average load for the full time faculty is over 47 WTUs. Last year one faculty member carried over 75 WTUs and another member had 1030 SCU in one quarter. The Music program contains only Music courses and GE&B courses, not a very diverse program.

The Budget Committee sees a severe budget consequence from this proposal. If this request is approved it will add to the already bad situation. For the music department faculty to reach a normal load of 36 WTUs per faculty member they will require 3 more faculty members.
Memorandum

To : Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From : E. J. Carnegie, Chair
       Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject : Budget Implications from the University Center for Teacher Education

Date : 12 May 1993
Copies : T Bailey

The proposal is incomplete - No expanded course outlines, No signatures, No paperwork to reduce units. The proposal as supplied leads to the conclusion of course overlap and a net increase in resources of over 15 WTUs.
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair
       Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Budget Implications from Liberal Studies

The Liberal Studies proposal has some severe affects on the campus GE&B offerings. If a department or college starts offering its own set of GE&B courses it will produce inefficiencies in both the proposed courses because of the low number of students (30-50) and the GE&B courses that they will replace. This alone could require from .5 to 3 new faculty positions.

The other proposed changes are small. A substitution of IS 230 for EDUC 300 and a small change in LS 461. A new course WS200 is added to the list of electives for the Women's Studies minor with no paper work to indicate how it will be implemented. The Budget Committee has a grave concern that this proposal will have a negative resource implication.
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair
       Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Budget Implications from Music

The proposal from the Music Department indicates a net increase of 22.5 WTUs. They are planning to add 12 new courses and only dropping one. The table below shows the affect and the faculty utilization for the 1992-93 year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Music Department</th>
<th>Major Changes</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MU 121</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 186</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 210</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 211</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 212</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 251</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 259</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 261</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 262</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 263</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 302</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 303</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Drop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU 386</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty in the Music Department at this time is very heavily loaded. The average load for the full time faculty is over 47 WTUs. Last year one faculty member carried over 75 WTUs and another member had 1030 SCU in one quarter. The Music program contains only Music courses and GE&B courses, not a very diverse program.

The Budget Committee sees a sever budget consequence from this proposal. If this request is approved it will add to the already bad situation. For the music department faculty to reach a normal load of 36 WTUs per faculty member they will require 3 more faculty members.
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair
      Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Budget Implications from the University Center for Teacher Education

The proposal is incomplete - No expanded course outlines, No signatures, No paperwork to reduce units. The proposal as supplied leads to the conclusion of course overlap and a net increase in resources of over 15 WTUs.
Memorandum

To: Jack Wilson, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: E. J. Carnegie, Chair
      Academic Senate Budget Committee

Subject: Budget Implications from Liberal Studies

The Liberal Studies proposal has some severe affects on the campus GE&B offerings. If a department or college starts offering its own set of GE&B courses it will produce inefficiencies in both the proposed courses because of the low number of students (30-50) and the GE&B courses that they will replace. This alone could require from .5 to 3 new faculty positions.

The other proposed changes are small. A substitution of IS 230 for EDUC 300 and a small change in LS 461. A new course WS200 is added to the list of electives for the Women's Studies minor with no paperwork to indicate how it will be implemented. The Budget Committee has a grave concern that this proposal will have a negative resource implication.