I. Preparatory
   A. The chair called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. after a 2-day recess.

II. Business Items
   A. Curriculum Proposals (debated and/or tabled during First Reading at the May 30/June 1 meetings)
      Second Reading

   SLA
   POLS 404 (GE&B, not accepted for inclusion in area F.2)
   M/S (Dobb, Music) to approve POLS 404 for inclusion in GE&B, area F.2.
   John Culver indicated that Knowledge and Skills Statement #9 specifically states that courses in F.2 area must be taught by faculty within the technological areas.
   Jim Murphy cautioned Senators that by approving this motion, they would be setting a precedent for overruling Knowledge and Skills Statement #9.
   The chair ruled the motion out of order. Knowledge and Skills Statement #9 was approved by a faculty referendum which is of a higher authority than the motion on the floor; therefore, if the motion passed, it would be declared null and void.
   M/S (Lewis, Murphy) to appeal/overturn the chair's decision.
   The motion was defeated; the chair's decision was upheld.

Social Science Individualized Course of Study Concentration
   M/S (Mori, Gooden) to approve Individualized Course of Study Concentration within the Social Science curriculum.
   Barbara Mori stated that the reason for this concentration was to allow more flexibility in advising students whose needs were not met with existing concentrations; with the new concentration, students must provide a rationale for the courses selected—courses could not be selected at random. Additionally, this concentration would allow a student to design a course of study more in line with specialized career goals. John Culver, Political Science Department, stated that the POLS Department already has an Individualized Course of Study Concentration; he explained that students don't pick a "mish-mash" of courses, but instead work closely with their advisor in selecting courses in line with their interests/goals.
   Tina Bailey stated that the Curriculum Committee disapproved the proposal because there was no core of courses to serve as a foundation for the concentration. Barbara Mori indicated that students identify a theme for their course of study and that theme becomes the core for the concentration.
   Since there was no further discussion, the chair called for a vote on the motion.
   11-20; the motion was defeated. The recommendation of the Curriculum Committee stands.

SPC 360 Mass Media Criticism (new course proposal)
   M/S (Gooden, Lewis) to accept the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee to approve SPC 360 as a new course.
   Nishan Havandjian, Journalism Department Head, expressed concern that the School Curriculum Committee reports do not go to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee; such reports might be helpful in providing more complete background information. He indicated that the School of Liberal Arts Curriculum Committee believes SPC 360 duplicates material already taught in the Journalism Department. He suggested that a plan of action might be to table further action, allow the course to be taught as an X course, and then during the next curriculum cycle interested departments reevaluate to decide if SPC 360 should be an interdisciplinary offering.
Ray Zeuschner, SPC Department, stated that the Speech Communication Department met with the Journalism Department on a number of occasions and that all offers for an interdisciplinary course were refused. SPC 360 has been offered this Spring Quarter as an X course. It is not being proposed as a required course, only as an elective.

Susan Duffy, SPC 360 instructor, indicated that she changed the course syllabus, texts, etc. to make every effort to avoid duplication of material.

Ray Zeuschner further stated that the School Dean approved the course by signing the curriculum proposal. The School Curriculum Committee vote was 3-0-4.

M/S/P (Kersten, Terry) to table the motion until further information could be submitted to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee for a reevaluation in the Fall.

SPSE

PSY 494 (GE&B inclusion)
M/S (Levi, Terry) to include PSY 494 in GE&B, area D.4.b.

Dan Levi stated his reason for wanting PSY 494 in area D.4.b was so that engineering students would be included in the class, thus creating a student balance which is necessary for the educational experience the course is trying to create. As an F.2, engineering students will not be enrolled. John Culver, GE&B Committee Chair, explained why the course does not meet the criteria for area D.4.b.

Since there was no further discussion, the chair called for a vote.
The motion failed.

ED 563
The objection was withdrawn. Since there was no discussion, the recommendation (Approval) of the Curriculum Committee stands.

M.A. Industrial Technology—3 specializations
The objection was withdrawn. Since there was no discussion, the recommendation (Approval) of the Curriculum Committee stands.

SSM

PSC 171 (GE&B; not accepted for inclusion in area F.2)

George Lewis reminded Senators of previous decision concerning POLS 404.
The chair ruled that the recommendation of the GE&B Committee not to include PSC 171 in area F.2 stands.

At this point in the meeting, there was considerable discussion concerning the number of courses in the catalog that had never been taught. Motions were made to delete those courses, but the Senate voted that such motions were out of order. M/S/P (Gooden, Berrio)

B. Curriculum Proposals—minors (debated or tabled during First Reading at the June 1 meeting)
Second Reading

Jim Murphy withdrew his original objection to the Integrative Technology Minor. Tina Bailey stated that there was still a concern for permanent 'housing' for the minor, and that the issue of a capstone course has been settled with PSY 494. The Integrative Technology minor was then included on the Consent Agenda with the other minors.

M/S/P (Gooden, Moustafa) to accept the following minors as recommended:

Women's Studies—APPROVED
Computer Science—APPROVED
Art—APPROVED
Economics Education—APPROVED
Mathematics—APPROVED
Integrative Technology—APPROVED
History—APPROVED
The chair and the Senate commended Tina Bailey and the Curriculum Committee for their efforts in facilitating an exceptionally smooth curriculum cycle.

C. Resolution on Department Name Change: Computer Science Department, Second Reading
Resolution on Department Name Change: EE/EL Engineering Department, Second Reading
M/S/P (J. Murphy, P. Murphy) to table both name change Resolutions until such time as a policy and procedure were developed to deal with department name changes.

III. Additional Business
A. The vice chair read a Resolution commending the chair for a year of exemplary service to the Senate and to the University.

IV. Adjournment
A. M/S/P (P. Murphy, Mori) to adjourn.
The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.
Preparatory:
The meeting was called to order at 2:20 p.m.

I. Minutes: The minutes from the May 2, May 9, and May 23, 1989 Executive Committee meetings were approved.

II. Communication(s) and Announcement(s):

III. Reports:

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Item(s):

A. The first summer meeting will be held July 18, 1989.

B. AY Calendar 1989-1990: The remainder of the calendar for the 1989-90 year will be determined at the July meeting.

C. Nominations to the Selection Committee for the Dean of SLA: Ed Beyer (Crop Science) and Jack Wilson (Mechanical Engineering) were chosen as the two individuals to the Selection Committee outside of the School of Liberal Arts. A minority report recommending Nancy Jorgensen will be submitted by the caucus chair for Professional Consultative Services.

D. Assigned time for the 1989-90 Chair: .60 assigned time was approved for the incoming Chair of the Academic Senate. The remaining .80 will be distributed after the Senate Secretary/committee chairs are selected in the fall.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment: time certain 2:55 pm
TO: Members of the Academic Senate

FROM: Daniel Levi and Charles Slem
Psychology and Human Development Department

SUBJECT: The Psychology of Technological Change (PSY 494) and the General Education and Breadth requirements

The Psychology of Technological Change course (PSY 494) is about how people and organizations are affected by technology. The course examines people's beliefs about technology, how organizations manage technological change, and the human and social factors which are important to consider when promoting technological change. The focus of the course is on a variety of technologies including office technology, computers, and advanced manufacturing technology and processes. This seminar is open to seniors and graduate students interested in the human resources issues related to the introduction of new technology.

In the fall of 1987, we submitted this course to the General Education and Breadth Committee of the Academic Senate to be included in Area D.4.b. The Area D. Committee believed that this was a good course and that it should be a General Education and Breadth option; however, they felt it should be under area F.2. (the technology area) instead.

The committee's main problem with this course being in Area D.4.b. was that it was not sufficiently international. The committee's decision was reasonable because we do not include the international component of the course in the course's description. In fact, there is a substantial international component to the course. How people and organizations response to technological change depends on their society and culture. During the course, we discuss technological change activities in the U.S., Canada, Europe (especially Germany and Sweden), India, Mexico, Korea, and Japan. However, the main international focus is comparing the U.S. with Northern Europe and Japan. As developers of the course, we have been doing cross-cultural research for the last two years primarily in Japan, so the international part of the course will probably increase.

Unfortunately, we were unable to communicate this information to the Area D. Committee. We wrote them a letter explaining that the course had an international component and offered to make a
presentation to them, but they had already referred the course to Area F.2. and did not want to reconsider it.

The Area F. Committee also agreed that PSY 494 would make a good General Education and Breadth course; however, they did not feel that it belonged in Area F.2. They feel that Area F.2. should be reserved for courses offered by technology departments. Some Area F Committee members wondered why we had not submitted the course under Area D.4.b. where they believed it obviously fit.

This is a common fate for interdisciplinary courses - they do not quite fit into the University system. We agree with both committees that the course belongs in the General Education and Breadth system and that there are legitimate reasons why it may belong (or may not belong) in different General Education and Breadth categories. Where we disagree with the committees is their conclusion - that the course should be dropped from General Education and Breadth considerations because the fit is not perfect in any one category.

We would have preferred to discuss this with the Area D. Committee or the General Education and Breadth Committee. After making repeated attempts to arrange a meeting, we were informed in May that the General Education and Breadth Committee does not entertain appeals. We are therefore forced to go directly to the Academic Senate Floor.

Our preference is that PSY 494 be included in the General Education and Breadth category D.4.b. Our reason is that it would be better for the students. The course is designed so that students from engineering, business, humanities, and the social and behavioral sciences can meet and discuss interdisciplinary issues related to technological change before they graduate from Cal Poly. If the course is included in Area F.2., then we would be unlikely to get many engineering students to take the course. This would significantly disrupt the student balance which is necessary for the educational experience the course is trying to create.

We hope that you will support us in our motion to have PSY 494 included in Area D.4.b. of the General Education and Breadth requirements. We feel that this is an important course for Cal Poly students.
Memorandum

To: Glenn Irvin, Interim Dean
   School of Liberal Arts

From: Gerald Sullivan
    Chair, SLA Curriculum Committee

Subject: Speech Communication Proposals

The Curriculum Committee recommends acceptance of the catalog proposals of the Speech Communication Department with the following exceptions:

1. Sp 360 Mass Media Criticism (new course proposal). The Curriculum Committee believes this course duplicates material from either Jour 118 Mass Media in Society or Jour 402 Social Responsibility of Mass Media (new course proposal). Sp 360 seems to be defining as its content a subject more appropriate for the Journalism Department to be offering, and, as a consequence, the Committee does not recommend its acceptance.

2. The new definition of the Speech Communication mission and function seems very broad and expands the Speech Communication Department into areas not central to its mission within the university. One section states: "The field of Speech Communication embraces communication in all its contexts: political, organizational, debate, small group, intercultural, instructional, mass media and performance of literature." This definition seems to move Speech into areas more appropriate for Journalism (mass media) and Theatre (performance of literature) than to a Speech Communication Department and could be the source of disciplinary disputes in curriculum in the future.

Randall Murray participated in the general discussion of the Speech Communications proposals by the Committee, but not in the discussions that led to the recommendations made in this memo. Because of his late appointment to the Committee to replace John Snetsinger, Richard Kranzdorf did not participate in any part of the Committee's discussion or recommendation on this proposal. The remaining three members of the Committee--Gerald Sullivan, Michael Malkin, Odile Clause--are responsible for this recommendation.