Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:16pm.

I. Minutes: The minutes from the November 14, 1989 Academic Senate meeting were approved without change.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
The Chair informed the Senate that the Resolution on Department Name Changes (AS-328-89/EX) had been approved by President Baker.

Attention was directed to the Academic Senate Reading List. Specific mention was made of the document entitled "Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973" which addresses services to students with disabilities.

III. Reports:
A. President's Office
B. Vice President for Academic Affairs
C. Statewide Senators
   T Kersten reported that the senators "...had a lively discussion with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors concerning the Trustees' action in November (1989) regarding their salary structure." The senators were assured that under the Management Personnel Plan, all salaries are set exclusively by merit.

   C Andrews asked if there was discussion on the issue of falsifying application information as it relates to the recent action of one of our Trustees and if there was a need to teach ethics at the university. T Kersten stated that there was concern and discussion at the committee level, but a resolution did not come forth. R Gooden stated that there was an ethical issue involved, but since the statewide Senate did not make the appointment, they lacked sufficient information to make a judgment. The Chair will refer these concerns to Ray Geigle, Chair of the Academic Senate CSU, for further action by the statewide Senate.

   J Weatherby requested senators with expertise in technology to review Draft #7 of the Structural Technology Commission Report entitled "the Student, the Faculty, and the Information Age: The Power of Technology." This document is on the Academic Senate Reading List and is available in the Academic Senate office. The topic is controversial and will be on the Trustees' agenda shortly.

D. Jan Pieper, Director of Personnel and Employee Relations, described her academic background and the Personnel and Employee Relations Department. The department implements various federal, state, CSU system, and campus regulations. It is unique in the CSU system in administering the personnel functions of both faculty and staff. The director reports to the university president. A document that describes the various components of the Personnel and Employee Relations Department is available in the Academic Senate office and is listed on the Academic Senate Reading List.
IV. Consent Agenda:
Curriculum Proposal for Grading in Human Development Courses Requiring Supervision was approved.

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Prerequisites for Upper Division Courses (first reading): moved to a second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting. T Bailey gave background information on the intent of the resolution. The intent was to identify prerequisites that could be used for screening students by a computerized registration system. Course or class-level prerequisites are an indicator to the instructor that the student may not be qualified for the course. A statement such as "consent of instructor" cannot be identified by a computerized system as a prerequisite but could be used in conjunction with other quantifiable prerequisites. Computerized screening would prevent students from enrolling without the desired background. The process would serve to check student preparation and instructor requirements. Prerequisites are intended to be as broad as possible and are developed by the department offering the course. Upper division courses should have prerequisites to justify being advanced courses.

J Coleman raised two issues: (1) scheduling and the problems associated with enrolling in required GE&B courses, and (2) the inability of the computerized system to identify a student that may be one course short of reaching a class-level prerequisite who would then be excluded from enrolling in any courses at that level.

W Reynoso asked how the evaluation of a transfer student's records would be incorporated into the computerized system early enough for incoming students to effectively use the system.

T Kersten stated that institutions that utilized a system of prerequisites abandoned them due to the difficulty of implementation.

B. Curriculum Proposal for Anthropology/Geography Minor (first reading): M/S/P (Hanson/Coleman) to a second reading. M/S/P (Mori/Weatherby). R Gooden called for a Point of Order to determine if there was urgency on the item. The Chair responded by saying that curriculum items should be in the Academic Programs office for processing by January 30, 1990. Curriculum items were distributed to the Academic Senate for review on November 9, 1989. T Bailey informed the Senate that a preliminary version of this proposal was submitted Spring Quarter 1989. The Curriculum Committee recommended against the proposal which was supported by the Senate. Recommendations made by the Curriculum Committee are reflected in the current proposal.

T Kersten questioned the status of new minors. The Chair reviewed a resolution passed last year (AS-312-89/CC) which, in general, stated that minors as programs "be evaluated while those in the pipeline would be allowed to continue." T Bailey stated that this minor is made up of existing courses. Resources seem to be a problem; however, resources were not part of the evaluative responsibility of the Curriculum Committee. This minor meets all of the evaluation criteria used to approve the minors that came forth in the spring. Resource evaluations for each minor were available to the Academic Senate during the initial review process.

C. Curriculum Proposal for Liberal Studies Program (first reading): M/S/P (Hanson/Berrio) to a second reading. M/S/P (P Murphy/Weatherby) to Table
until the January 30, 1990 Academic Senate meeting.

T Bailey reported that the Liberal Studies program had been the primary vehicle for the Teaching Credential candidate's degree program. State mandates now require a separate Liberal Studies program which is to be in place by September 1990. Although there are problems with the proposal that cannot be resolved immediately, it is the best proposal that can be put forth at this time. The Curriculum Committee supports the proposal with one exception: due to limited resources, the committee recommends a 6-unit Senior Project in place of the 3-unit Senior Project/3-unit Senior Seminar.

W Reynoso requested clarification of Section VI.5 AD MATH elective (4) (B.2). P Murphy stated that he believed the AD MATH elective would satisfy the 3-unit GE&B requirement of Area B.2. The department requires four units of math and the GE&B requirement is three units of math. The "B.2" designation on that line is misleading and should be removed. In addition, he questioned whether the committee that governs the Liberal Studies program would be more representative of the School of Science and Mathematics if the credentialing requirements were separated from the major. Margaret Glaser, Coordinator for the Liberal Studies program, answered "yes."

L Dalton requested a curriculum display to clarify the proposal. Margaret Glaser will provide the requested information at the next Academic Senate meeting.

D. Curriculum Proposal for SPC 360: moved to a second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting. Senator N Havandjian referred to Ray Tippo, Associate Professor of Journalism, for comment. Ray Tippo stated that SPC 360 overlapped with JOUR 118 and JOUR 402 (proposed), and therefore he was not in support of the proposal. A memo (dated February 27, 1989) from the Chair of the Liberal Arts Curriculum Committee to Glenn Irvin, Interim Dean for the School of Liberal Arts, supported this position.

R Zeuschner presented a historical perspective of the course. He also shared with the Senate the Speech Communication Department's willingness over the last two years to work out differences with the Journalism Department.

J Weatherby reminded the debaters that issues of this type should be resolved within the school and not on the floor of the Senate.

E. Curriculum Proposal for M.S. in Structural Engineering: moved to a second reading at the next Academic Senate meeting. T Bailey stated that the Curriculum Committee believes the program is sound and recommends approval. The disagreement regarding the CE prefix change is a technical matter.

H Mallareddy stated that both departments are in favor of the program. The unresolved prefix change involves one course (CE 407) and the resources it generates. Furthermore, the CE (Civil Engineering) faculty believe that this resolution is being forced upon them. S Moustafa, caucus chair for the School of Engineering, tried to resolve the issue by arranging a meeting with the respective department heads. This failed. He suggested that the Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs arrange a meeting with the respective deans to resolve the issue prior to the next Academic Senate meeting. R Gooden requested that the respective parties provide the Senate with a rationale of the jeopardy.
P Murphy stated that this program has been on hold for years in the hope that the parties involved would come to resolution. It is now time to vote on the resolution.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

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