Preparatory: The meeting was called to order at 3:14 pm.

I. Minutes: The minutes from the May 8, 1990 Academic Senate meeting were approved with two minor word changes. Under Communications(s) and Announcement(s) in the third paragraph "encourage" was changed to "encouraging" and in the fourth paragraph "attend" was changed to "participate".

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):
Attention was directed to the Academic Senate Reading List.

President Baker approved the Resolution on Prerequisites for Upper Division Courses (AS-330-90/CC).

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair
   There will be an Academic Senate meeting May 29, 1990. This will be the last meeting of the academic year.

   The 1990/1991 Executive Committee will meet June 5, 1990. The business of this meeting is the appointment of faculty to Academic Senate and Universite-wide committees.

   An errata sheet from the Chair, dated May 11, 1990, for the May 22, 1990 Academic Senate meeting was passed out. Business Item(s) V.E and V.H were pulled from the agenda. The Resolution on New Criteria and Policies for Area F.2 Courses was added (Business Item I) and moved to the top of the Business Item(s) Agenda.

   Supplementary information was made available for Business Items A, B, and J.

B. President's Office

C. Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office
   P Bailey introduced John Lindvall, Chair of the Multi-Criteria Admissions Committee. Bailey complimented Lindvall and the committee for their efforts. A Memorandum (May 22, 1990) from P Bailey titled Multi-Criteria Admissions Model was distributed. John Lindvall reported on the committee's progress and addressed the Freshman MCA Model, Student Diversity Model, and gave a specific description of the Freshman MCA Model. A copy of Bailey's memorandum is available in the Academic Senate office. Lindvall requested comments on the model from the general
faculty by June 1, 1990. The Freshman MCA Model should be completed by fall of 1990.

The budget for 1990/91 based on reductions could prove to be the "worst case scenario" for Cal Poly. Quite a few of the faculty/staff positions that were allocated may not be available due to budget reductions.

D. Statewide Senators

E. ASI Representatives

F. Sarah Lord summarized the Avenal College Bound Program. The purpose of the program is to make high school students aware that college requires something of them while they are still in high school. She requested that faculty become involved with this type of program. A copy of the report is available in the Academic Senate office.

G. Robert Lucas, Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies, Research, and Faculty Development, discussed the operation of the Graduate Studies and Research Office. The five principal areas covered by this office are: Graduate Studies, Research, Grants Development, International Studies, Faculty Development and Centers and Institutes. A copy of the presentation is available in the Academic Senate office.

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):
   Item I was added to the agenda and moved to the top of the Business Item(s). The Chair of the Instruction Committee requested that Business Item D precede Business Item C. C Andrews requested the Agenda remain "as is." There was no objection to this request.

I. Resolution on New Criteria and Policies for Area F.2 Courses: (M/S/P) (Weber/Beyer) to return this motion to the Area F.2 Subcommittee for action before coming to the GE&B Committee and the Academic Senate. B Weber stated that there are inconsistencies between the background material and the resolution and that the resolution should go to the subcommittee for action. J Harris stated for the record "that the Chair of the GE&B Committee did not have an opportunity to present the resolution."

A. Resolution on Education Department Reorganization (Second Reading): this item will appear as a second reading item at the May 29, 1990 Academic Senate meeting. The resolution was distributed prior to the meeting. C Hagen, Chair of the Long-Range Planning Committee, explained the resolution and stated that the major concern was the inadequacy of resources to implement the reorganization. Kenneth Palmer, Interim Head of the Education Department, informed the body that there is no reason to believe that teacher education under the proposed structure will cost any more than it does currently. P Bailey stated that he did not propose the reorganization; he took it over as part of his present assignment. The proposed organizational structure will encourage and/or require an all-university responsibility and has flexibility. The Chair gave a history on the proposal and stated that Kenneth Palmer's memorandum of May 21, 1990 will be mailed for review prior to the next meeting. The memorandum addresses
many of the concerns being raised. MaryLinda Wheeler, Professor of Physical Education and Recreation Administration, addressed many of the Whereas clauses in the resolution. The following questions/concerns/issues were raised during the lengthy discussion that followed:

- How would other schools, as the School of Engineering, enter into the program?
- This proposal is very new to many senators; its organizational structure is different than that which exists on campus; and there are many unanswered questions.
- Is there a summary of how this proposal is an improvement over the existing organization?
- What is the significance of our action in accepting or rejecting the proposal?
- How are the concerns of the school districts going to be resolved?
- What are the resource advantages of this proposal?
- How is the proposed unit going to be self-supporting?
- Resource adjustment problems and the viability of the affected school need to be addressed.

B. Resolution on Women’s Resource Center and Women’s Resource Center Coordinator (Second Reading): M/S/P (Freberg/Mori). A revised resolution was distributed. Modifications that were recommended at the first reading have been incorporated into the resolution. The Academic Senate is asked to support the resolution. C. Andrews questioned the source of funding and commented on the narrowness of the title and position. P Lutrin mentioned that Student Academic Services presently supports the Multicultural Center and other programs which assist under-represented individuals on campus. T Bailey stated that the main focus of the resolution is women and one of the major problems for women is the absence of a network and the possession of networking skills. L Burgunder offered a friendly amendment to the Resolved clause. The proposed Resolved would read:

That the Academic Senate support the proposal for a Women’s Resource Center and a Women’s Resource Center Coordinator to provide support and networking primarily for women and which may extend to other underrepresented groups such as ethnic minorities and returning students; to plan and coordinate Women’s Programming; and to serve as a visible hub for communication with other groups on campus, in the Cal State System, and in the community.

There was no objection to this friendly amendment.

C. Resolution on Elective Credit/No Credit Grading (Second Reading): M/S (Hanson/Andrews). M/S/P (Vilkitis/Andrews) to send this resolution back to committee to be reworked. Ray Terry, Chair of the Instruction Committee, stated that the revised resolution does not reflect the committee’s intent, and it is not clear whether the Resolved clause can be achieved.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:01pm.