

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California

**Minutes of the ACADEMIC SENATE**

May 14, 1996  
UU 220 3:10-5:00pm

I. Minutes: none

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s): The chair noted that tensions surrounding the GE & B proposal are high and that email had been quite accrimonious. While disagreements are expected, he asked the group to agree to keep their comments respectful.

He also announced two procedural items. Resolution C on the agenda is easier to resolve. So it will be dealt with first.

All items are first reading items. Members of the Senate are to give constructive criticism and suggest ways to make documents acceptable. The goal is to gather information to enable us to come to a conclusion.

III. Reports: none

IV. Consent Agenda: none

V. Business Items:

A. Resolution on University-wide committee appointments. This resolution involves the development of an information competency program for the university. The proposed committee should have representatives from the library, information services and the colleges. The goal will be to devise some measurement, test, or courses to cover competency.

Q. Is the requirement discipline specific? R The state level shows two needs, lower level is generic, the upper tier is department specific. Q. How would it relate to F1 (of the GE & B program)? Courses should meet the elementary level requirements. Currently there is no place that has a standard.

B. **Resolution to Approve General Education and Breadth Program Proposed.** The chair of the ad hoc committee recapped the highlights and history of the two GE & B proposals. The Senate chair determined that the two resolutions would be discussed separately. Questions, comments and replies included the following:

Q/C Does the governing board make recommendations to the provost, then to the Senate?

Q/C The governing board has poor representation of the six colleges. There should be one from each. R GE is based in Liberal Arts and Science and Math. The resolutions have this intent.

Q/C Our caucus supports having members elected university-wide, not by colleges. Committee members should have release time. The Directorship should be opened to the whole campus. The four "outside" colleges would fight for the two available positions. R This is a philosophic difference. The old system caused gridlock. The people who teach GE should oversee the program.

Q/C Is General Education a separate program or an add-on to other programs? I have a different proposal which implies trust by mandating that college and governance boards have to approve the program.

Q/C Is the director a voting member? R He is the seventh member.

Q/C An eight-member committee plus director was suggested. This would include all colleges.

Q/C I have concern regarding the appointment of the director. It should be made by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, not the administration. The Senate should propose a governing structure which doesn't remove so much power from the colleges. Since a Baccalaureate degree is one-third GE & B, the faculty should control the content. The Senate should be the highest authority. How is the will of faculty to be understood if the VP for Academic Affairs is involved?

Q/C I support GE but feel this is important to him as a professor of a non-GE college. I want better representation of the other colleges. The directorship qualifications are too restrictive. They eliminate all but the two GE & B colleges.

Q/C The creation of new courses is not a prerogative of this committee. New directions would come back to the Senate for approval rather than consultation.

Q/C I suggest a university wide election. What are the term limits? R The plan was to have some staffing to allow consistency, a 3, 2, 1 year term.

Q/C The directorship needs to be more open to other colleges with the Senate having final approval of the committee. When replacement occurs, it should be handled by the college not represented.

Q/C We need to be building more cooperation to team teach and develop goals to have students learn more about ethics. The faculty should espouse this. R I concur and feel a small committee would be more efficient.

Q/C The governance board should not report to the Provost but to the Executive Committee of the Senate.

Q/C GE & B requirements were by state mandate, so courses must be approved.

Q/C The genesis of GE & B is a product of the faculty, even though the approval of the administration is needed. There should be as much variation in the template as possible.

Q/C I'm concerned that PCS is not a part of the board. Size is not a correlation of efficiency.

**C. Resolution to Approve General Education and Breadth Program Proposed**

Q/C What is the technology elective? Is it for Engineering, Agriculture?

Q/C There seems to be a discrepancy between the Executive Order and the template.

Q/C To allow for coherence, movement and consolidation are needed. The translation of semester to quarter hours is inaccurate. R Flexibility is given to the University on this matter.

Q/C Emphasis should be in Arts and Humanities, not the Social Sciences.

Q/C Add the technology option, but only one 4-unit course is too small an offering. Offer an opportunity for 8 units. R Look at the templates as a vehicle.

Q/C Concerning the letter grade issue, there must not be credit/no credit options. R The consensus is that GE & B courses must be rigorous. The maximum of credit/no credit courses is now 45 units or 15 courses during the Cal Poly career.

Q/C When President Baker is here, we should have deviations in mind as well as a release time statement for the governance board. The Provost and the President should be saying the same thing.

Q/C Is release time really gratuitous?

Q/C I am unhappy that area 4 not included in the extra course options.

Q/C Are we counting Social Sciences as a science or non science-based major? R The definition is not clear. Q/C This needs clarification to allow what will work.

The chair asked that suggestions on changes, concerns, etc. be to the chair by Friday. The committee will meet and discuss all the input. This meeting will be closed, but a discussion meeting would be possible. The meeting on May 28 will be the second reading of the resolutions.

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

Submitted by

Maureen Forgeng

Q/C The creation of new courses is not a prerogative of this committee. New directions would come back to the Senate for approval rather than consultation.

Q/C I suggest a university wide election. What are the term limits? R The plan was to have some staffing to allow consistency, a 3, 2, 1 year term.

Q/C The directorship needs to be more open to other colleges with the Senate having final approval of the committee. When replacement occurs, it should be handled by the college not represented.

Q/C We need to be building more cooperation to team teach and develop goals to have students learn more about ethics. The faculty should espouse this. R I concur and feel a small committee would be more efficient.

Q/C The governance board should not report to the Provost but to the Executive Committee of the Senate.

Q/C GE & B requirements were by state mandate, so courses must be approved.

Q/C The genesis of GE & B is a product of the faculty, even though the approval of the administration is needed. There should be as much variation in the template as possible.

Q/C I'm concerned that PCS is not a part of the board. Size is not a correlation of efficiency.

**C. Resolution to Approve General Education and Breadth Program Proposed**

Q/C What is the technology elective? Is it for Engineering, Agriculture?

Q/C There seems to be a discrepancy between the Executive Order and the template.

Q/C To allow for coherence, movement and consolidation are needed. The translation of semester to quarter hours is inaccurate. R Flexibility is given to the University on this matter.

Q/C Emphasis should be in Arts and Humanities, not the Social Sciences.

Q/C Add the technology option, but only one 4-unit course is too small an offering. Offer an opportunity for 8 units. R Look at the templates as a vehicle.

Q/C Concerning the letter grade issue, there must not be credit/no credit options. R The consensus is that GE & B courses must be rigorous. The maximum of credit/no credit courses is now 45 units or 15 courses during the Cal Poly career.

Q/C When President Baker is here, we should have deviations in mind as well as a release time statement for the governance board. The Provost and the President should be saying the same thing.

Q/C Is release time really gratuitous?

Q/C I am unhappy that area 4 not included in the extra course options.

Q/C Are we counting Social Sciences as a science or non science-based major? R The definition is not clear. Q/C This needs clarification to allow what will work.

The chair asked that suggestions on changes, concerns, etc. be to the chair by Friday. The committee will meet and discuss all the input. This meeting will be closed, but a discussion meeting would be possible. The meeting on May 28 will be the second reading of the resolutions.

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

Submitted by

Maureen Forgeng