I. Minutes: Approval of the January 4 and January 11, 1994 Executive Committee minutes (pp. 2-4).

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

III. Reports:
   A. Academic Senate Chair
   B. President's Office
   C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
   D. Statewide Senators
   E. CFA Campus President
   F. ASI representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   A. Academic Senate/university-wide committee assignments (p. 5).
   B. Resolution on The Review of Telecommunications Course Offerings as New Courses-Dana/Nulman/Vilkitis (p. 6).
   C. Election of faculty to the Faculty Committee for Charter Evaluation and Rejection or Implementation [BRING THE NAMES OF YOUR NOMINEES TO THIS MEETING].
   D. Election of faculty to the consultative committee to select a Vice President for University Relations and Development [BRING THE NAMES OF YOUR NOMINEES TO THIS MEETING].
   E. Establishing an ad hoc committee to investigate the use of technology in delivering academic programs/curriculum (pp. 7-8).

VI. Discussion Item(s):
   A. Discussion of the University Center for Ethnic Studies.
   B. Relocation of Engineering Technology faculty within the CENG.
   C. Formation of a committee to review/revise the existing program discontinuance procedures.
   D. "Consultation"...within a Collective Bargaining Context"-Russell (p. 9).

VII. Adjournment:
ACADEMIC SENATE/COMMITTEE VACANCIES
FOR 1993-1994

Academic Senate vacancies
Academic Senate Secretary-elect

Academic Senate Committee vacancies
CAGR
- Elections Committee
- Status of Women Committee
- Univ Prof Leave Committee (replcmnt for Wheatley)

CAED
- Constitution & Bylaws Committee
- Curriculum Committee
- Elections Committee
- General Education & Breadth Committee
- Personnel Policies Committee
- Research Committee
- Student Affairs Committee
- University Professional Leave Committee
- Calendar-Curriculum Committee
- Cultural Pluralism Subcommittee

CBUS
- Constitution & Bylaws Committee

CLA
- Long-Range Planning Committee (replcmnt for Engle, '93-94)

CSM
- Constitution & Bylaws Committee
- Elections Committee
- Status of Women Committee
- Student Affairs Committee
- University Professional Leave Committee

PCS
- Curriculum Committee
- Elections Committee
- Instruction Committee
- Library Committee
- Long-Range Planning Committee
- Personnel Policies Committee

ALL COLLEGES
- GE&B Subcommittee, Area A (Lang & Crit Thking) one vacancy
- GE&B Subcommittee, Area E (Lifelong Understg/Dev) one vacancy
- Animal Welfare Committee
  (one Academic Senate representative whose primary
  concerns are in a nonscientific area;
  i.e., ethicist, lawyer, clergy) one vacancy
- Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) one vacancy
- ASI Risk Management Committee one vacancy
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY

AS-94/EC (Draft)
January 4, 1994

THE REVIEW OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS COURSE OFFERINGS AS
NEW COURSES

WHEREAS, The future of California is directly tied to meeting the educational needs of the next generation; and

WHEREAS, The demand for higher education is increasing beyond the present limits of the CSU to accommodate; and

WHEREAS, A principal objective of telecommunications is to provide instructional experiences to students, to accommodate explosive enrollment growth, and to meet the educational and manpower needs of the next generation; and

WHEREAS: The Academic Senate supports advancements in teaching technologies and encourages new and innovative models and methods of teaching; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate is the formal policy-recommending body in matters of curriculum and academic standards; and

WHEREAS: The curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, The use of emerging information technologies will require development of appropriate pedagogues; and

WHEREAS, The employment of emerging information technologies has significant implications for curriculum and academic standards; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That courses offered for academic credit through telecommunications media be treated as new courses and appropriate course proposal be submitted to the Curriculum Committee of the Academic Senate for customary review and approval; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate instruct its Chair to remind the Administration of the Academic Senate's responsibility in matters affecting curriculum, and academic standards.
To: Executive Committee

From: Jack Wilson, Chair

Subject: The Virtual University

As we are all aware there is much faculty concern about the place of multimedia and distance learning in higher education. The recent article about The Virtual University in the TT brought to mind some of those concerns. Decisions concerning multimedia and distance learning have and are being made by the administration with little or no faculty input. In the case of the new IBM 9000 mainframe computer the decision by the administration to purchase was made despite faculty opposition. A main reason for purchasing it was to support multimedia. A person has been hired, her salary split between the state and IBM, to support faculty development of multimedia. I could go on and on but it is not productive to rehash past decisions except as they impact academic programs and more specifically curriculum. Curriculum is the province of the faculty and no one else.

Therefore it is time, and in fact past the time, for the faculty to begin the process that sets in place the accommodation of multimedia and distance learning into education here. If we are not careful multimedia and distance learning will drive curriculum and not the other way around. Multimedia and distance learning have their places in higher education, let's get out front and determine what those places are. Then we can set the policy that will insure that multimedia and distance learning don't become the cart that drives the horse called curriculum.

We understand that multimedia and distance learning are different technologies with different applications. I think of multimedia as being primarily a way to supplement the traditional lecture. Therefore it will impact campus instruction. I understand distance learning as a way to reach students off campus who are not able, for a variety of reasons, to attend classes on campus.

We all recognize that it is important to begin to grapple with the program and curricular issues inherent in multimedia and distance learning. This will involve budgets since there is a substantial initial cost of putting into place the technology component of multimedia and distance learning. That is something we will probably never address, unfortunately, given the propensity in this nation to buy into technology without considering the downside.

At any rate I propose we establish an ad hoc committee composed primarily of faculty which would address the following. First, are these technologies already driving academic programs and curriculum and how? If the answer is affirmative, what does
the committee recommend as steps to insure the integrity of programs and curriculum. Or to put it another way, what steps are necessary to insure that faculty retain control of programs and curriculum?

From the resource angle we would want to get a handle on the resources now being directed to multimedia and distance learning. What have the expenditures involved with those resources bought us?

Where do we want to go with these technologies? What is the place of multimedia in instruction on this campus? What is the place of distance learning for this campus? What if we decide that the campus is at point A and would like to move to point B, what would the cost be? What would be best way to get there? What is the need, and then what is the plan to get there without breaking the bank?

A larger more fundamental question that we might want this committee to look into is the impact of multimedia on instruction and learning.

There is already a committee, composed primarily of faculty that has been appointed by Carol Barnes, Dean of Extended Ed., to look into distance learning. Dennis Nulman is our representative on that committee.

There are as usual a number of ways we can build this committee. My first notion was that we have someone from the budget and instruction committees and someone from the Instructional Advisory Committee on Computing. Then we could select a few other faculty. We would want a student and perhaps a staff person on it also. I believe it is important that we have faculty on this committee who have some knowledge about and practical experience with multimedia, and perhaps distance learning, and yet are open minded about these technologies and their impact on instruction and learning. That is that they realize there are pros and cons. In other words no technophiles wanted. I can think of people who I believe fit the bill.

I visualize this committee receiving a multiple-step charge. There are some things we would like from it so the full senate can act on it this academic year, and there are perhaps other things that could wait until the next academic year.

Give me your input ASAP (can you do it this week?). I'll put together all of our thoughts and based on that try to present a proposed committee makeup and charge for our consideration at our Feb. 1st meeting. Meantime be thinking of people you would recommend for this committee. I would like to get if formed and going by the beginning of the 6th week of this quarter.
At its meeting of September 27, 1993, the Academic Senate approved the following Report presented by Cecilia Mullen for the Organization and Government Committee.

"CONSULTATION" UNDER IV.D OF THE STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC SENATES WITH A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING CONTEXT

IV.D of the statement covers two matters: the academic calendar and selection and review of administrators. In these two areas, Presidents have said that they are entitled to prepare the initial draft of a policy proposal and are entitled to determine its final form and content. The Academic Senate is to be "consulted", but it is not, unless requested, to revise the President's draft and present its revision to him/her for approval or rejection.

It is suggested that the following procedure be followed for consultation on IV.D policies:

1. The President's draft should be laid before the Executive Committee. If the Executive Committee agrees that the proposed policy comes under IV.D, it should refer the draft to the appropriate policy committee for consideration as stated below.

2. The policy committee should review the draft and prepare a report for the Senate stating its conclusions and recommendations. It should not revise the President's draft but, in its report, may propose changes.

3. The draft and the policy committee's report should be considered by the Senate. The Senate should not make changes in the text of the draft, but should act on the policy committee's report, which it may amend or revise. The report, as approved by the Senate, shall be sent to the President for his/her consideration before issuance of the policy.
January 25, 1994

RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM INTERESTED FACULTY TO THE CHARTER CAMPUS COMMITTEES ON GOVERNANCE, FISCAL FLEXIBILITY, AND EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Order of Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berrie, Mark</td>
<td>Arch Engr</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, J. Wyatt</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver, John</td>
<td>Poli Sci</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLey, Warren</td>
<td>Social Sci</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drucker, Howard</td>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooden, Reg</td>
<td>Poli Sci</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havandjian, Nisha</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Mark</td>
<td>Mech Engr</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkailah, Faysal</td>
<td>Aero Engr</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelfelder, Diane</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller, Wesley</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Kenneth</td>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seim, Edwin</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warfield, David</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Grant</td>
<td>C &amp; R Plg</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FISCAL FLEXIBILITY COMMITTEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Order of Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahern, James</td>
<td>Agribus</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, J. Wyatt</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havandjian, Nisha</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head, Dwayne</td>
<td>P.E. &amp; K.</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lund, Michael</td>
<td>Ani Sci</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller, Wesley</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seim, Edwin</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warfield, David</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Grant</td>
<td>C &amp; R Plg</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMPLOYEE RELATIONS COMMITTEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Order of Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berrie, Mark</td>
<td>Arch Engr</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLey, Warren</td>
<td>Soc Sci</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgeng, William</td>
<td>Mats Engr</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havandjian, Nisha</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller, Wesley</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Kenneth</td>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seim, Edwin</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>2 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn, Mina</td>
<td>Speech Com</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warfield, David</td>
<td>Crop Sci</td>
<td>1 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Grant</td>
<td>C &amp; R Plg</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>