

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, California
ACADEMIC SENATE

REV. 3/87
MAY 1987
Academic Senate

ACADEMIC SENATE - MINUTES
Tuesday: May 12, 1987
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

Chair: Lloyd H. Lamouria
Vice Chair: Lynne E. Gamble
Secretary: Raymond D. Terry

I. Preparatory

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. upon obtaining a quorum.
- B. The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of April 28, 1987 were approved as mailed.

III. Communications

The Chair called the Senate's attention to numerous informative memos. In view of today's lengthy agenda, the Chair encouraged each Senator to read the contents of II individually.

III. Reports

- A. President's Office: None
- B. Academic Affairs Office

Bob Lucas made a brief report on the Fresno Student Research Competition in which Cal Poly students (from SENG and SAGR) took two of the nine prizes awarded.

Lucas also reported that 80% of the Cal Poly faculty who were selected to receive the Trustee survey form have returned it with their completed responses.

C. Statewide Academic Senators

All three CSU Senators were present, but waived their reports in view of the lengthy agenda.

IV. Consent Agenda: None

V. Business Items

A. Catalog Changes for 1988-1990: Science & Mathematics (Second Reading)

1. M /S (Dana /Cooper): To adopt the SOSAM course proposals for Biology, Chemistry and Mathematics (with the exception of the Math 099 proposal).

2. M /S /P (Murphy /Cooper): To amend the SOSAM curriculum proposals by the addition of Mat 099 to the course offerings.

Paul Murphy asserted that there will be a stressful transition period of approximately four years during which time the new Trustees' admissions requirements will be in effect, but students will continue to be admitted who have little chance of passing the lowest level mathematics course that we will be permitted to offer for baccalaureate credit.

Bill Forgeng suggested including the course in the new catalog, but for one cycle only.

Charles Crabb urged the Senate to include the course without an X designation, as suggested by the Curriculum Committee.

The motion to amend passed with only one negative vote.

3. M /S /P: To adopt the curriculum proposals from SOSAM, as amended.

The motion was adopted, but not unanimously.

B. Catalog Changes for 1988-1990: Engineering (Second Reading)

1. M /S (Dana /Botwin): To adopt the Curriculum Committee recommendations regarding the SENG curriculum proposals.

2. M /S (Vigil /...): To amend the Curriculum Committee recommendations for SENG curriculum proposals to approve the inclusion of ENVE 435.

Sam Vigil defended the proposal as an internal adjustment made by the CE Department to establish necessary consistency between CE and ENVE. The change would have no effect on any other department. Moreover, numerous CE courses had been redefined to permit the inclusion of ENVE 435 in the curriculum without increasing the number of units required for graduation.

Tal Scriven supported philosophically the concept of leaving the content of ENVE up to the CE/ENVE Department.

The motion to amend was adopted unanimously.

3. M /S (Horton / ..): To amend the SENG curriculum package by approving those changes that would permit EE/EL to introduce block scheduling to its students in their junior year.

Roxy Peck asked if the block scheduling proposals would apply to non-majors taking the courses under consideration. Jim Harris indicated that exceptions would be made for non majors.

Donna Pinney (ASI Representative to the Academic Senate) spoke against the proposal. She presented the Engineering Council's May 6, 1987 Resolution #87-01: Opposition to Block Scheduling which was adopted by the Engineering Council by a vote of 17-0-2.

Charles Wolf, an ASI Senator and member of the Engineering Council, also spoke against the concept of block scheduling.

Charles Dana asserted that the block scheduling proposal was a misuse of the notion of co-requisite.

At the request of Jim Harris, Bill Horton withdrew his motion to amend the curriculum committee recommendations for SENG.

4. M /S (Forgeng /...): To permit the Metallurgical Engineering Department to continue to offer Met 463 as a one-unit course.

Tal Scriven, Departments' rights advocate, urged the Senate to let METE be METE.

The motion to amend was adopted unanimously.

5. M /S (Horton /...): To amend the Curriculum Committee recommendations for SENG by approving the pre-requisite changes for EL/EE courses (disapproved by the Curriculum Committee).

Charles Dana accepted the amendment as "friendly."

6. Y. C. Yong moved the inclusion of ME 234 in the SENG proposals to be taken by transfer students instead of ME 134. The connection between these two courses was not clear to everyone.

Tal Scriven urged the Senate to let ME be ME.

After some discussion, and because there was no written proposal, nor justification, the Chair ruled that the ME 234 proposal would be referred back to the Curriculum Committee for further action on 5/19/87 and /or 5/26/87.

7. Charles Dana corrected two items of the report: EL 447 was disapproved by the Curriculum Committee. A separate page was available concerning the computer science curriculum proposals.

8. The question was called. *The SENG curriculum proposals, as amended, were adopted on a voice vote.*

B. Catalog Changes for 1988-1990: Remainder of SOSAM; Part of SLA. (First Reading)

1. Tal Scriven requested that discussion of the Philosophy Department's proposals be deferred until 5/19/87 at which time they would be at first reading status. Neither the Chair nor Charles Dana objected.

2. George Lewis advised the Senate concerning the GE&B implications of GEOL 302, 303.

3. Neal Fleishon requested that discussion of I.C.2. (a proposal to add an Electro-optics Concentration) of the Physics Department's

curriculum proposals be deferred until 5/19/87 at which time they would be at first reading status. Neither the Chair nor Charles Dana objected.

4. Discussion commenced concerning the English Department's proposal to offer a Technical Communication Certificate. Charles Dana claimed that the Curriculum Committee felt that the program would be weak and was, in general, opposed to a certificate program. It was established that certificate programs are offered by the School of Agriculture and by the Foreign Languages Department. Susan Currier faulted the Curriculum Committee for its conflicting criticism of the proposal and for its failure to make any suggestions as to how to strengthen the proposed program.

5. Bill Little spoke in defense of SPAN 111, 112, 113 (disapproved by the Curriculum Committee). He argued that the sequence paralleled SPAN 101, 102, 103, but had differing emphasis and vocabulary. The standards of competence will be equally high in each sequence.

6. The course proposals from SOSAM and SLA included in the package entitled: Addendum to May 12 Agenda will advance to Second Reading status on May 19, 1987.

C. Resolution on Goals and Objectives (Second Reading)

1. M /S (French /Andrews): To adopt the Resolution on Goals and Objectives.

2. Reg Gooden proposed three amendments to the Resolution, which were accepted as friendly.

1st Whereas, Planning for likely changes in its social, demographic, technologic, and institutional environment provides Cal Poly with a mechanism to adapt to these changes and shape its own future;

4th whereas, the University Academic Planning Committee is the body charged by CAM with recommending goals for the university and with recommending the most orderly and effective ways in which to achieve those goals; therefore be it

5th resolved, That the magnitude and importance of this task warrants that faculty members of this committee be given reduced

workloads in Fall 1987 and Winter 1988 which allow them to give this task adequate attention.

3. Speaking against the motion were George Lewis (who saw no compelling reason for a call to action) and Barbara Hallman (who felt that such a study would be destructive and discounted the projections of demographers).

4. Tim Kersten objected to the use of words like "technologic." Steve French insisted that he had checked the word's existence and use in a dictionary.

5. Speaking in favor of the motion were Jim Conway and Charles Andrews.

6. Paul Murphy moved to delay action on the Resolution due to the lateness of the hour. The motion was approved by consensus.

D. Resolution on GE&B Area F Courses for 1988-1990 (First Reading)

Due to the lateness of the hour this item will be carried over to the May 19 Academic Senate meeting, where it will again be at a first reading status.

E. Resolution on Enrollment for Units Without Credit (First Reading)

Due to the lateness of the hour this item will be carried over to the May 19 Academic Senate meeting, where it will again be at a first reading status.

VI. Discussion Item: Recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee on Measures of Effectiveness

This item was deferred to a subsequent meeting.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.