I. Minutes:

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. CSEA Campus President
G. ASI Representatives

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
A. Resolution on Statement on Academic Freedom—Berrio, Chair of the Personnel Policies Committee, second reading (to be distributed).
B. Curriculum Proposals for the School of Liberal Arts—Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (to be distributed).
C. Curriculum Proposal for Aeronautics and Astronautics Concentrations—Bailey, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, first reading (to be distributed).

VI. Discussion Item(s):
A. Ethnic Pluralism—curriculum development, faculty recruitment, student retention, campus environment, and community outreach.

VII. Adjournment:
The 1990-91 academic year was the beginning of a new catalog/curriculum cycle based upon the concept that the first year should be a review of new programs as well as major program revisions while the second should be a review of minor changes in catalog materials.

The committee began its review of major programs during Fall Quarter 1990. We looked at eighteen proposals for new degree programs or major revisions of existing programs. After communications with departments and resubmissions, twelve were forwarded to the Academic Senate. The rest were either tabled until Fall 1991 or have yet to be heard from.

During spring quarter 1991 the committee reviewed all other changes in the fifty-plus programs in the university. The following are observations, recommendations, concerns and comments the committee would like to pass on to the Senate as a whole.

1. Graduate Programs

We are concerned about the number of graduate courses which exist in some programs and the number of proposals received for graduate classes. While we concur in the validity of graduate programs in specific areas, we wonder about the numbers of graduate students enrolled in graduate programs. There is a serious question about the number of students which constitute the critical mass necessary to stimulate intellectual growth and to foster the professional comraderie characteristic of a quality graduate program.

In addition we question the large numbers of graduate courses in some programs which are of small or modest size. It is argued that those courses are "paying for themselves" by their enrollments. However, if the program is small who is populating the classes? Advanced undergraduates is the usual answer. That is acceptable to a point, but if almost the entire graduate class is composed of undergraduates, there is a valid concern about the level of the material presented as well as whether the course would more appropriately be classified as 400-level.

And how many different content courses should a department teach?

Might some courses with related or sequential material be grouped under one title with varying content. By proliferating courses are we violating a tenet of "truth in advertising"?

2. Change in Mode and Level

A trend in moving courses from lower to upper division which was noticed during the last catalog cycle seems to have lessened. It should be noted that this has serious resource implications and we have requested substantial justification for such moves.

There was a different change evident in our review - laboratory to lecture mode as well as activity to laboratory mode. Without going into our discussions about these moves, the general concern we have is about the conflict of mission and resource generation. Cal Poly's motto of "learn by doing" may be severely compromised by the need to accommodate large numbers of students in single instructional sections. This is no where more evident that in the laboratory intensive
technical fields. For safety as well as effective pedagogy some programs choose to run 12-16 student upper division laboratory sections while mode and level allocations necessitate 17+ students to break even. In the lower division 22+ students satisfy the generation formula.

In going from activity to laboratory the number of units may be decreased, the allocation formulas are optimized but - this is a large BUT - the student spends more time in class. For example, altering a 4 unit activity class to a 3 unit lab results in one less unit but one extra hour in lab. If then a student is required to take two labs concurrently of, say, 3 and 5 units, the schedule of said student has 24 hours of laboratory per week and then must have at least 4 more units of classes - more likely 4-10 more units. While we respect the professional decisions of individual departments, we strongly urge all programs to consider the scheduling demands placed upon their students. Not only do many of them have to manage 190-210 unit programs many with lab, but they must also be concerned about sequencing courses, handling 3-6 different types of material, dealing with CAPTURE, having last priority, and scheduling their courses for optimal learning. It might be an interesting exercise to have an entire faculty attempt to physically schedule a suggested curriculum for three quarters in their majors and then contemplate how a student will deal with that schedule on top of the added pressures of young adulthood.

3. Program/Course/Faculty Member Correlation

In our opinion it is unwise for a program to be developed which depends solely upon the existence of one faculty member. This would also pertain to required course offerings. Our catalog is a contract with the student and indirectly with the population of the state. We should make every effort to ensure the maintenance of that contract.

4. Core Skills versus Applied Knowledge

There is an ongoing conflict concerning what should and should not be taught by a home department especially in applied fields. Sometimes these problems are worsened by the perceived requirements of certification and accreditation bodies. Each program individually and then some instructional body as a whole should consider the fundamental skills necessary for a program and supplied by the core schools such as Liberal Arts and Science and Mathematics as well as the essential applied knowledge which is to be imparted through the specific program. An individual program cannot, and indeed should not, try to be everything to everybody. Flexibility in a program should be considered an asset which can help the student optimize his/her education.

5. Overlap

Although this issue is being addressed in other committees, we would like to reiterate that there is overlap in curriculum that should be acknowledged and resolved through cooperation rather than conflict.

6. General Education and Breadth

Our committee applauds the work of Lee Burgunder and the GEB Committee this year. However, it seems as if the deliberations of our committees should be better coordinated so that our curriculum presentations to the Academic Senate could be consolidated. A suggestion is to incorporate the GEB Committee as a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee with the chair of the GEB Committee sitting as a member of the Curriculum Committee. A similar suggestion might also be incorporated as pertains to graduate program curricula.
7. Effective Use of X-courses

The committee gave "favored course status" to new courses which had been offered as X-courses and had a good track record. This is an excellent way to test new courses and can be used on the graduate as well as undergraduate levels.

8. Library

With the severe restrictions placed upon the library in the current fiscal crisis, it is imperative that those responsible for proposing new programs or courses contact their library staff representative (each program has one) and realistically plan and develop their proposals in coordination with reasonable existing resources.

This year's experiences have convinced the members of the Curriculum Committee that the current process of curriculum development and review is agonizingly archaic. In Fall Quarter 1991 we will be considering ways in which to facilitate the process, to maximize the responsibility of individual departments in curriculum decisions, and to allow the committee and the Senate to consider the broader areas of implementing the university mission through the curriculum process. During this summer we hope to research how other institutions within and outside of the CSU system carry out their curriculum processes and we plan to present to our Senate some significant resolutions in a timely manner.

As chair of this committee, I would like to publicly acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the members of this committee.

Respectfully submitted,

C.A. (Tina) Bailey, Chair, SSM

Members:  Glenn Casey, SAGR   Laura Freburg, SPS
           Glen Irvin, Acad Affairs Madeleine Johnson, LIB
           Chi Su Kim, LIB       David Pierce, SAED
           Jim Sena, SBUS       Jeff Schwartz, ASI
           Ramesh Shah, SENG    Richard Simon, SLA (Fall and Winter)
           Mary Whiteford, resident curriculum/catalog expert
May 31, 1991

Caesar Naples
Vice Chancellor of Faculty & Staff Relations
California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, Ca 90802-4275

Dear Caesar:

Your joint letter with Dale Hanner of May 22 to CSU Campus Presidents is an interesting piece of fiction and "leverage" and I congratulate you both on your creativity in that regard. However, the letter plays very loosely with some facts relevant to CFA and I wanted to respond to that circumstance.

While we appreciate your acknowledging the fact that CFA has indeed proposed alternatives, we are distressed that the CSU administration through such a memorandum would break the spirit of negotiations which we believed were occurring on these matters. As always, serious negotiations are best kept in the bargaining room. We are concerned that this standard of labor-management relations could be broken in such a cavalier manner.

As you know, CFA is not persuaded that either layoffs or compensation reduction are necessary to address the budget shortfall reflected in the Trustees' action in March. The CSU has sufficient resources at its disposal to totally negate the need for layoff or compensation reduction.

The CFA first identified a lengthy list of such options in February and has reiterated and refined the list in several meetings with the CSU administration since February. In our last meeting with Acting Chancellor McCune, we identified more than $100 million in options that the CSU has refused to exercise to avoid or mitigate layoff and compensation reduction. We still do not comprehend the unwillingness of the CSU administration to entertain many options which would avoid layoff and compensation reduction.

From among the proposals CFA has made, I would single out one as most illustrative of the intransigence of the CSU administration in response to CFA efforts to help lessen the impact of the budget crisis on the CSU program. The CFA proposed and the CSU administration rejected seeking statutory approval for utilization of the more than $40 million in excess revenues and reserves in the Parking Fund. CFA specifically suggested using these excess funds to mitigate tuition increases and employee layoffs. In rejecting the CFA proposal, the Campus Presidents indicated they did not want anyone snooping around in their trust funds.
The May 22 memo also falsely implies that CFA is somehow obligated to negotiate a
deferral of faculty MSAs because of the Trustees' action in March. The new agreement
(MOU) between the CFA and the CSU Trustees, which was ratified by the Trustees this
month, includes a provision that faculty are to be paid MSAs during 1991-92. One would
wonder, then, why two CSU Vice Chancellors would communicate to Campus Presidents
that somehow the matter of MSAs for faculty was unresolved or that, even worse, CFA was
somehow obligated to give these up and had been unresponsive to CSU administration efforts
to achieve that end.

Further, some of CFA's proposed alternatives to compensation reduction have been accepted
by the CSU administration and these proposals amount to more than the $5 million CFA
committed itself to in the new MOU.

It is our understanding that other CFA proposals are still under consideration by the
administration. We are merely awaiting an administration response and not having much
success getting one.

Imagine our surprise then to see a memorandum implying that CFA and other employee
unions are guilty of bad faith or something worse on this matter. People who live in glass
houses should not throw stones.

If the CSU wishes to resolve such matters with CFA, you and other representatives of the
administration with whom we have been negotiating know exactly where to find us and that
we have never yet turned down an invitation to meet in regard to them. In fact, we have
usually had to sit and wait for weeks before getting a response to our request to meet -- or,
after having met, wait for weeks for a response to our proposals. So, give it a try. It is
likely to work better than the May 22 memorandum.

Sincerely,

John M. Hein
General Manager

cc: Acting Chancellor McCune
    CSU Campus Presidents
    Sandy Wilcox
    Campus Senate Chairs
    CFA Board of Directors
    CFA Chapter Presidents
Memorandum

To: Presidents

From: Caesar J. Naples
Vice Chancellor
Faculty and Staff Relations

Date: May 22, 1991

Subject: Merit Salary Adjustment Cost Distribution

The budget reduction plan endorsed by the Board of Trustees at its March 12-13, 1991, meeting included a reduction of $21,000,000 to be achieved by "Seek(ing) the agreement of the bargaining representatives for a salary cost reduction to be achieved by an 11 month deferral of merit salary adjustments (MSA), or other comparable salary reduction plan." The need for the inclusion of this part of the plan, and in fact the entire plan, had been reviewed and discussed with the bargaining representatives several times before the plan was endorsed by the Board of Trustees.

Action on this proposal, or an alternative if suggested by a union, is necessary before July 1, 1991, when employees become eligible for MSAs. Each union has been notified of our proposal on deferral of MSAs, but no agreement with any union has been reached at this time. The only union with which there have been discussions of alternatives has been the California Faculty Association (CFA), and their suggestions, if implemented, would result in some undetermined amount of savings not likely to total much beyond their commitment in the contract to identify $5,000,000 in faculty compensation reductions.

It is therefore necessary to allot to campuses a further increase in the mandated savings targets (unallocated reductions). These are not prorated by campus on the basis of percent of budget as in the case of other prorata reductions, but are rather based upon the amounts identified as generated on each campus by MSA award eligibility.

Should any individual bargaining representative agree to deferral of MSAs or some equivalent salary reduction in a timely manner, each campus' savings target will be reduced by the appropriate amount. For the convenience of campuses who wish to make reductions based in any way upon the basis for generation of the costs, there is also included a breakdown by bargaining unit of MSA costs for each campus.

JMS

cc: Dr. Ellis E. McCune
1991/92 FINAL BUDGET - REDUCTION OF NEW YORK BY C.B. UNIT
BY GENERAL FUND ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUSS</th>
<th>UNIT R01</th>
<th>HEALTH CARE</th>
<th>UNIT R02</th>
<th>UNIT R03</th>
<th>UNIT R04</th>
<th>UNIT R05</th>
<th>UNIT R06</th>
<th>UNIT R07</th>
<th>UNIT R08</th>
<th>UNIT R09</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE</th>
<th>MP CONFIDENTIAL</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAYWARD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>259.529</td>
<td>61,159</td>
<td>10,510</td>
<td>24,251</td>
<td>50,571</td>
<td>6,429</td>
<td>58,469</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>149,025</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>636,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORDHAM</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>6,157</td>
<td>641.352</td>
<td>81,116</td>
<td>15,440</td>
<td>15,420</td>
<td>66,114</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>71,350</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>191,325</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,125,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. LUIS BEJOSPO</td>
<td>17,324</td>
<td>6,996</td>
<td>478.507</td>
<td>65,909</td>
<td>21,561</td>
<td>34,214</td>
<td>87,367</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>124,368</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>206,799</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,049,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICO</td>
<td>8,319</td>
<td>6,633</td>
<td>470.404</td>
<td>60,822</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>57,800</td>
<td>4,597</td>
<td>68,774</td>
<td>3,126</td>
<td>172,493</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>897,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESNO</td>
<td>15,850</td>
<td>15,206</td>
<td>766.662</td>
<td>108,676</td>
<td>23,542</td>
<td>57,388</td>
<td>32,180</td>
<td>10,743</td>
<td>248,889</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>239,109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,539,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMBOLDT</td>
<td>3,897</td>
<td>6,218</td>
<td>232.836</td>
<td>66,576</td>
<td>12,148</td>
<td>14,272</td>
<td>42,031</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>65,429</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>125,977</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>566,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERKELEY</td>
<td>7,038</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>198.616</td>
<td>20,291</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>4,234</td>
<td>33,780</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>34,300</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>76,195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>514,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONG BEACH</td>
<td>16,316</td>
<td>14,220</td>
<td>1,044.746</td>
<td>126,213</td>
<td>35,510</td>
<td>15,189</td>
<td>122,763</td>
<td>14,490</td>
<td>163,562</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>293,267</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,856,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>15,523</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>462.457</td>
<td>103,051</td>
<td>27,695</td>
<td>17,926</td>
<td>96,066</td>
<td>13,730</td>
<td>128,872</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>227,215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,121,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULLERTON</td>
<td>6,62J</td>
<td>12,273</td>
<td>733.282</td>
<td>71,142</td>
<td>17,250</td>
<td>16,524</td>
<td>93,528</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>104,416</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>175,272</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,243,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICAN HILLS</td>
<td>5,823</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>341.511</td>
<td>24,763</td>
<td>12,390</td>
<td>26,331</td>
<td>7,275</td>
<td>28,648</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>129,529</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600,347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACRAMENTO</td>
<td>17,632</td>
<td>16,789</td>
<td>708.170</td>
<td>68,554</td>
<td>14,543</td>
<td>13,293</td>
<td>55,123</td>
<td>5,711</td>
<td>115,966</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>190,308</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,219,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO</td>
<td>5,616</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>425.379</td>
<td>55,410</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>10,773</td>
<td>70,640</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>3,037</td>
<td>108,874</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>753,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN DIEGO</td>
<td>47,332</td>
<td>12,919</td>
<td>745.287</td>
<td>63,170</td>
<td>34,608</td>
<td>25,027</td>
<td>140,023</td>
<td>7,736</td>
<td>18,014</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>283,299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,527,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN MARCO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,504</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>25,331</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH RIDE</td>
<td>14,825</td>
<td>16,275</td>
<td>722.862</td>
<td>101,061</td>
<td>28,164</td>
<td>23,617</td>
<td>105,346</td>
<td>7,211</td>
<td>126,616</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>245,133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,325,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO</td>
<td>10,522</td>
<td>16,767</td>
<td>888.056</td>
<td>110,818</td>
<td>20,853</td>
<td>16,488</td>
<td>111,563</td>
<td>12,093</td>
<td>126,158</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>266,365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,534,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOSE</td>
<td>24,910</td>
<td>9,637</td>
<td>1,038.662</td>
<td>28,160</td>
<td>22,862</td>
<td>22,862</td>
<td>110,912</td>
<td>11,066</td>
<td>158,966</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>285,188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,721,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONOMA</td>
<td>10,008</td>
<td>4,795</td>
<td>1,807.113</td>
<td>26,899</td>
<td>13,055</td>
<td>129,966</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>12,051</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>151,401</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>670,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANFORD</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>177.076</td>
<td>22,742</td>
<td>10,403</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>45,111</td>
<td>55,185</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>65,152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>432,072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total Campuses** $252,461 | $170,673 | $10,526,939 | $11,574,005 | $373,318 | $340,002 | $1,541,398 | $0 | $430,937 | $2,106,413 | $29,000 | $1,541,398 | $2,106,413 | $591,840 | $2,228,137 | $451,594

**Systemwide Offices** 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0

**Systemwide Provisions** 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0

**Sub-Total, non-campus** 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40

**Grand Total** $252,461 | $170,673 | $10,526,939 | $11,574,005 | $373,318 | $340,002 | $1,541,398 | $0 | $430,937 | $2,106,413 | $29,000 | $1,541,398 | $2,106,413 | $591,840 | $2,228,137 | $451,594

17 May 91
WHEREAS, the University Self-Study for Accreditation stated:

A clear statement of commitment to academic freedom should appear in the University Catalog where it is equally visible to students, faculty, and interested external constituencies; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following statement be printed in the University Catalog:

Statement on Academic Freedom

Cal Poly recognizes and supports the principle of academic freedom, by which each faculty member has the right to teach, to conduct research, and to publish material relevant to that faculty member's discipline, even when such material is controversial. The university also guarantees to its faculty the same rights shared by all citizens which include: the right to free expression, the right to assemble, and the right to criticize and seek revision of the institution's regulations.

At the same time, the faculty should recognize an equally binding obligation to perform their academic duties responsibly and to comply with the internal regulations of the university. Each faculty member is expected to recognize the right of free expression of other members of the university community; intolerance and personal abuse are unacceptable. When acting as private citizens, faculty members are expected to make it clear that they are not acting as representatives of the university.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
May 9, 1991
**AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS CONCENTRATIONS**

**AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

School of Engineering

Date: April 29, 1991

1992-94 CATALOG PROPOSALS

VP (Vice President Academic Affairs), AS (Academic Senate),
CC (Curriculum Committee)
A = Approved, A* = Approved pending technical modification,
AR = Approved with Reservation (see Committee Comments),
T = Tabled (see Committee Comments), D = Disapproved

### I. CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aeronautics Concentration (25)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO 405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aero dynamics II (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO 443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Vehicle Design (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO 444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Vehicle Design (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO 445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight Vehicle Design (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics electives (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Astronautics Concentration (25)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERO 451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbital Mechanics I (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*AERO 447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacecraft Design (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*AERO 448</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacecraft Design (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*AERO 449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacecraft Design (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronautics electives (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New electives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**AERO 407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reentry Aerodynamics (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**AERO 452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbital Mechanics II (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New required course

**New elective course**

### II. COMMITTEE COMMENTS
RESOLUTION

Whereas: There is a significant budget crisis at Cal Poly for the current and several future years, and

Whereas: There is a need to reduce the number of faculty in order to meet the financial reductions, and

Whereas: Such reductions will require the elimination of lecturer positions and some tenure-track positions, and

Whereas: Such reductions will affect the ability of the University to meet the academic needs of the students at Cal Poly, and

Whereas: Such reductions in faculty will reduce course offerings which will result in reducing the ability of the students to take courses needed to complete their degrees in a reasonable period of time, and

Whereas: The attendance at most intercollegiate athletic events is very low, which indicates a lack of student interest in the athletic programs at Cal Poly, and

Whereas: The coaching staff has their primary teaching responsibilities in activity classes, rather than in required academic courses, and

Whereas: The Academic Program Review Task Force recommended a reduction in Intercollegiate Athletics by 50 %, and

Whereas: The Dean's Council recommended a 20 % reduction, therefore, be it

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University express its support for a minimum reduction of 20% effective for academic year 1991-92, and an additional 20% effective for
ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California

AS-91/
RESOLUTION ON
ACADEMIC FREEDOM

WHEREAS, The University Self-Study for Accreditation stated:

A clear statement of commitment to academic freedom should appear in the University Catalog where it is equally visible to students, faculty, and interested external constituencies;

therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the following statement be printed in the University Catalog:

Statement on Academic Freedom

Cal Poly recognizes and supports the principle of academic freedom, by which each faculty member has the right to teach, to conduct research, and to publish material relevant to that faculty member's discipline, even when such material is controversial. The university also guarantees to its faculty the same rights shared by all citizens which include: the right to free expression, the right to assemble, and the right to criticize and seek revision of the institution's regulations.

At the same time, the faculty should recognize an equally binding obligation to perform their academic duties responsibly and to comply with the internal regulations of the university. Each faculty member is expected to recognize the right of free expression of other members of the university community; intolerance and personal abuse are unacceptable. When acting as private citizens, faculty members are expected to make it clear that they are not acting as representatives of the university.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Personnel Policies Committee
May 9, 1991
RESOLUTION ON
ETHNIC DIVERSITY

WHEREAS, Cal Poly's Student Ethnic Diversity Coalition asked the Academic Senate to address a number of issues of concern to them including:
* Low graduation rate of ethnic minorities,
* The need to increase the number of underrepresented students,
* The need to create ways to retain underrepresented students,
* A need to increase the number of underrepresented faculty,
* The need for curriculum changes to reflect ethnic diversity, and
* The need for faculty cultural sensitivity;

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate has gone on record in the past in supporting efforts aimed at enhancing cultural diversity at the Cal Poly campus;

WHEREAS, The welfare of all Cal Poly students is of primary concern to Cal Poly faculty;

therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate take note of the concerns expressed by the Student Ethnic Diversity Coalition;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That appropriate Academic Senate committees address the issues raised and make appropriate recommendations to the Academic Senate during the 1991-1992 academic year;

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the University administration take note of, and address, the concerns articulated by the Student Ethnic Diversity Coalition.

Proposed by:
Safwat M. A. Moustafa, Professor
Mechanical Engineering Dept.
June 4, 1991