

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA ®
December 2, 1996**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Presiding Officer Jeffrey L. Warburton at 3:05 p.m. in Room 146 of the College of Law.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Anderson, Atwater, Barrett, Clarke, Coons, Dahlgran, D. Davis, Dvorak, Dyl, Emrick, Erickson, Feltham, Garcia, Gerber, Glittenberg, Gruener, Huete, Joens, Larson, Levy, Maré, Medine, Meyer, Mitchell, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pitt, Poss, Reeves, Schiffer, Schooley, Schwarz, Silverman, Sliger, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Troy, Warburton, Weinand, Williams, Wilson, Witte, and Zwolinski. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Brown, Chen, T. Davis, Desai, Forbes, Garrard, Gore, Hurt, Jacobs, McCaslin, Myers, Pacheco, Sharkey, Sugiyama, and Taylor.

2. OPEN SESSION

Senator S. O'Brien distributed a brochure entitled "Campuses in Every County," which provides information and statistics about the outreach efforts of the UA's College of Agriculture throughout the state of Arizona. She highlighted two endeavors: (1) a nationally recognized educational program for 3,000 Apache County youth regarding postponing sexual involvement; and (2) an agricultural program for students in Gadsden School District (Yuma County), in which over 300 middle-school participants managed eight school-site gardens, then charted the movement of produce from local fields to the consumer. Senator O'Brien noted that these are just two examples of over 150 cooperative extension agricultural and youth programs being conducted in Arizona every day by UA faculty members. She reminded At-Large Senators that they represent not only faculty on campus, but also those who serve elsewhere in the state, such as the aforementioned 150, who brought outreach programs to over 200,000 Arizonans during the past calendar year.

3. REPORTS

3A. Chair of the Faculty John Schwarz

Chair Schwarz reported that the Staff Advisory Council had kindly decided to rename its scholarship fund the Emily Krauz Staff Endowment Fund, in honor of the late manager of the Faculty Center, and to combine its scholarship funds with those that have been collected in the Emily Krauz Staff Scholarship Fund, which was established earlier this fall by the Faculty Center. By combining the funds in these two accounts, Dr. Schwarz noted, approximately \$1,000 to \$2,000 can be awarded every year to eligible staff members, predominantly for academic purposes.

Dr. Schwarz also commented on the shared governance proposal to be discussed in the Senate today and again in the new year. He recalled that he had run for the position of Chair of the Faculty with the issue of shared governance as a high priority. He noted that he is among the faculty members who believe that, too often in the past, policies have been put into place at the University without having appropriate faculty input, involvement, and acceptance. The proposal that the Senate will be discussing calls for a number of changes in the policy-making process of the University. Taken together, Dr. Schwarz said, these changes will give faculty a responsibility in the making of policy that is fully befitting of our highly qualified faculty. It will be a faculty role in policy-making that few other universities could surpass. He added that he believes that our very talented faculty will contribute an enormous amount to the forward progress of the University through the policy-making process that is proposed. Many people from the original working group representing both the faculty and the administration, as well as from the Committee of Eleven, from the Senate Task Force, and from the Senate's Academic Personnel Policy Committee, have devoted much thought, a great deal of time, and a lot of effort to develop the shared governance proposal to its current stage. Dr. Schwarz thanked these groups for their hard work, and he concluded by saying that he looks forward to the discussion in the Senate as we further develop the proposal and move toward bringing about the establishment of shared governance on our campus.

3B. Secretary of the Faculty Rose Gerber

No report.

3C. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Jeffrey Warburton

No report in the interest of conserving time.

3D. President of ASUA Rhonda Wilson

Senator Wilson noted that students are preparing for final exams. The ASUA leadership is preparing to launch a legislative initiative; several bills, including some aimed at increasing the amount of student financial aid available, are being developed in conjunction with student leadership at the other state institutions. At the University level, ASUA is working hard to complete teacher evaluations, so that they can be published next fall. ASUA is also working with the office of Assistant Vice President Lucido on the problem of the UA's recent enrollment decline; by exploring ways to make students feel more comfortable on campus, student leaders hope to increase the retention rate.

3E. Provost Paul Sypherd

No report in the interest of conserving time.

3F. President Manuel Pacheco

No report, since President Pacheco was unable to attend.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator J. O'Brien asked Chair Schwarz how we will know when shared governance happens; he noted that this has been a slogan for many years, but how will we know when it is actually here? Dr. Schwarz responded that when the Senate decides it is ready to move forward with shared governance, a number of things should start happening that do not currently occur. For example, in the development of new policies, faculty representatives to committees working on these issues will be elected by faculty, rather than being chosen by administrators. Another example is that the Provost, vice presidents, and others will be reviewed periodically by faculty-chosen committees; in the review of the Provost, for example, the committee will deliberate with the President to reach a mutually acceptable conclusion regarding the review. When these and other similar situations occur consistently, Dr. Schwarz added, we will know that shared governance has been brought into being. He also noted that an oversight committee will be created to assure that precepts of shared governance are followed consistently.

Senator Witte commented that all of what Dr. Schwarz described is already contained in policies previously adopted by the Faculty Senate but never put into effect. This is despite the fact that, after much diligent work on the part of the UA faculty, a faculty governance law was passed in the state legislature, which mandates the same kinds of procedures that Dr. Schwarz described. Senator Witte added that the shared governance procedures outlined in the draft document appear to be a step backward from what is already law. She asked what would be different if the shared governance document is adopted. Dr. Schwarz responded that the shared governance proposal calls for many things, such as those he already mentioned in his reply to Senator J. O'Brien.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 14, 1996, AND NOVEMBER 4, 1996

The minutes of the special Faculty Senate meeting on October 14, 1996, were approved with the following correction: Senators Barrett and Emrick attended the meeting and should be listed among those who were present. The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on November 4, 1996, were approved as distributed.

6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS (Attachment)

Senator Warburton explained that the consent agenda is a parliamentary convention used for items that have gone through the appropriate committee channels and are not expected to require review or discussion by the full Senate. However, he added, it is always permissible for any Senator to remove an item from the consent agenda in order to have it discussed by the Senate. He also noted that Item "c" on today's consent agenda has been removed, because it needs to be accompanied by another Hydrology and Water Resources request; both requests will be brought to the next Senate

meeting. Thus, only Items "a" and "b" on the consent agenda will be considered today; they are both being brought to the Senate as seconded motions from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee

Motion 1996/97-34, to change the name of the School of Library Science to the School of Information Resources and Library Science. Passed unanimously.

Motion 1996/97-35, to change the name of the M.A. in German to the M.A. in German Studies. Passed unanimously.

7. **REPORT ON PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS (Attachment)**

Senator Schooley, Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, reported that, as requested at the last Faculty Senate meeting, the committee had reviewed the report on Promotion and Tenure Statistics, Actions Taken in 1995-96 To Be Effective in 1996-97. He commented that the committee had found nothing particularly remarkable about the overall trends; the statistics are well within the normal fluctuations evidenced in recent history. The committee did note that there were seven occasions on which a positive recommendation at the departmental level was reversed by the college-level promotion and tenure committee; in four of those cases, the decision was reversed again at the University level (i.e., supporting the original departmental recommendation). Dr. Schooley suggested that this type of situation perhaps argues in favor of implementing University-level guidelines for promotion and tenure to provide more uniformity; a draft outlining possible University-level guidelines was placed on Senators' desks today and will be discussed at a Senate meeting in the near future. Regarding specific questions on the statistics, Senator Schooley noted that he had requested clarification from the Provost concerning the three cases in which an extension was granted (listed at the bottom of the front-page summary sheet of the report). The three cases were never brought to a final decision, they were suspended prior to that point in the review process. Two of those suspensions were due to the compassionate extension policy detailed in the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel*. The third case will be re-reviewed in Fall 1997; it was suspended because of a complaint of an improperly constructed departmental committee, and it is being resubmitted during this review cycle. In addition, the report notes that two individuals whose negative promotion and tenure decisions were appealed to the President have been granted re-reviews which are ongoing currently.

Senator Garcia asked Senator Schooley if he had obtained any information regarding the nature of the re-reviews in the last two cases mentioned; Senator Schooley indicated that he had not. Senator Garcia wondered aloud what level of faculty input had been provided in the re-reviews, and he suggested that Senator Schooley might inquire about that.

Senator Schiffer mentioned the possibility that the President, in making those types of decisions for re-reviews, may, in fact, be making promotion and tenure policy anew. This raises some troubling questions, he noted, which the APPC might wish to explore further. He also commented that he is familiar with one of the cases, and the department head is being railroaded. Senator Schooley commented that, while he is not familiar with the specifics of these particular cases, he has been at the University for some time, and the re-reviews seem a bit unusual. In the past, the President has tended to either sustain or overturn the negative decision, rather than calling for a re-review.

Senator Schiffer moved [**Motion 1996/97-36**] that the Academic Personnel Policy Committee be asked to gather additional information regarding the two promotion and tenure cases in which the President has overturned a negative decision, in order to determine if this sort of process is fair to departments and is in conformity with grievance policies and faculty guidelines; motion seconded.

Senator Gruener asked if this is an appropriate action for the Senate. He said it appeared to him to be an interference, if we are just going to obtain information about these cases. If we intend to consider policy, that is another matter, but if we plan to examine the specifics of an individual faculty member's record, that clearly goes beyond the purview of the Senate.

Senator Garcia clarified that the motion was not intended to gather specific details about the two cases, but to determine whether the re-reviews constitute a change in the manner in which promotion and tenure is carried out at this institution.

Motion 1996/97-36 passed unanimously. Senator Warburton asked Senator Schooley to report back on this matter as soon as possible.

Senator Dyl asked if the promotion and tenure data contained in this report are public information, to which Senator Warburton responded in the affirmative.

8. DISCUSSION OF SHARED GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT (Attachment)

Senator Warburton announced that the discussion of the shared governance document, which was distributed on Senators' desks at the November 4 Senate meeting, would need to conclude at approximately 4:15, so that additional Senate business on the agenda could be discussed.

Senator Schooley first updated the Senate on what had occurred regarding the document since it was placed on Senators' desks. The APPC has met several times since then and has invited written comment from Senators, as well as deans, directors, and department heads. To date the committee has received written comments from eight individuals—some Senators and some department heads. Dr. Schooley noted that the committee is still in the discussion mode with regard to the document; it has debated several issues, particularly those reflected in the footnotes. Senator Schooley then introduced members of the earlier shared governance Senate task force who were present: Senator Zwolinski, Senator Szilagyi, Senator Sypherd, and Chair Schwarz. Scott Jacobs was the other member of the task force. APPC members and Chair Schwarz have also been invited as observers to a meeting on December 6, at which 40-50 department heads will discuss the document. At this point, the committee is still inviting and gathering comment and discussion. After today's Senate meeting and the meeting with department heads on December 6, the APPC plans to meet and develop a revised shared governance draft endorsed by the committee; this document will be placed on Senators' desks at the January 27 Faculty Senate meeting. Senators will have a week to review the document before the next Senate meeting on February 3, at which time, Dr. Schooley concluded, the committee hopes to bring the document for a vote in the Senate.

Senator Witte asked a procedural question: Are any General Faculty hearings or meetings scheduled, so that the faculty can review the document? She noted that the draft had undergone numerous revisions since the last time the General Faculty had seen it; since the faculty is most affected by this document, they should have at least one or two opportunities to see the draft and respond to it. Senator Schooley responded that the APPC had assumed that Senators and department heads would engage faculty in that process as they formulated their own comments; a General Faculty meeting has not been scheduled. However, the APPC does plan to meet again with the Senate task force before finalizing the draft. Senator Witte asked if the draft would be distributed to the General Faculty as part of the Senate minutes. After some discussion, it was agreed that, rather than hold the draft to distribute with the December minutes, the shared governance document would be distributed to the General Faculty in a mailing separate from the minutes. Senator Witte requested that the document be distributed without editorial comment. Dr. Schooley made a point regarding item #10 in the shared governance draft, which deals with conflicts between it and the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws: The APPC has discussed this issue and has agreed that the possibility of amendments to the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws should not be ruled out. One example of that, he noted, is the discussion in the document of an elected Committee on Committees, whereas the current Constitution and Bylaws call for that committee to be appointed.

Senator Witte made two general comments: (1) The term "shared governance" should be used, rather than "co-governance," which is a neologism whose meaning is less widely agreed upon and understood. (2) The two documents that provide the framework for whatever is implemented with regard to shared governance are the Faculty Constitution and the shared governance law; anything we do should not conflict with those documents, but should strengthen and enforce them.

Regarding item #2 in the document, which relates to the recruitment, selection, retention, and review of heads of departments or academic unit directors, deans, vice provosts, and vice presidents, Senator Pitt noted that retention of a department head would require a vote of the department's faculty, yet it appears that the dean would set the time period for the reviews of the faculty head. She asked if it would be possible to include a specific time frame for the reviews of unit heads in the document. Senator Schooley responded that currently the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* calls for normal reviews every five years. That would remain the same unless there is sentiment for change.

Dr. Schooley noted that there is also a provision for extraordinary reviews in the shared governance document (in the last sentence of item #2). He added that several written comments the committee had received involved some confusion about this item. For the first time, this document calls for reviews of provosts, vice presidents, and other administrators, while the *UHAP* currently addresses only reviews for deans and department heads. Thus, it is not clear whether the requirement for a written petition of one-fifth of the constituent faculty refers to all administrators or only those at the higher levels. Another point is that in some smaller departments, one-fifth of the faculty could be only one or two unhappy individuals. At this point, Senator Schooley commented, the APPC's discussion is leaning toward

retaining the present majority vote requirement at the departmental or college level in order to initiate an extraordinary review of a department head or dean, with perhaps a lower percentage requirement for an extraordinary review of higher-level administrators.

Senator Feltham noted that over the years we have awarded tenure by hiring outside of the University, with such programs as targets of opportunity. He asked if people hired in this way will have to meet the same criteria outlined in the document, and if so, what will the procedure be? Senator Schooley replied that in his own department, candidates have received a positive recommendation by the department's promotion and tenure committee before being made a job offer. Senator Medine noted that the English Department has essentially the same provision; anyone who is being considered for a position beyond the entry level must be reviewed by the promotion and tenure committee. Senator Schooley commented that there are many implementation details that are not contained in the shared governance document; if this document or some variation of it is adopted by the Senate as a framework for shared governance, units and colleges will need to write their own implementation procedures. These details may vary from unit to unit.

Senator Medine asked Senator Sypherd how many colleges have provisions for review of outside candidates by unit promotion and tenure committees before being hired. Senator Sypherd responded that in his four years of UA experience, he could not recall an instance of a tenured individual being hired from outside the institution without such a review by the unit's and college's P&T committees; while it may not be outlined in official policy, it appears to be the common practice. Senator Neuman noted that he remembered one such case; while he was serving on a college P&T committee, a department head was hired without being reviewed by that body. Dr. Schooley pointed out that perhaps the individual was reviewed by the departmental P&T committee before being made the offer.

With regard to the extraordinary review mentioned in item #2, Senator Sypherd cautioned that a department could be in constant turmoil if a very small minority of the faculty could call for an extraordinary review; he suggested that it would be more responsible to have a requirement of a percentage closer to a majority. Senator Schooley said the APPC had the same opinion as they reviewed the document. He also pointed out that it is not always clear what constitutes the "constituent faculty" for a particular administrator, especially in the case of those who serve in more than one capacity, such as dean and vice provost.

Senator Maré expressed puzzlement at what is achieved by having faculty evaluations of department heads and other administrators. He said he had observed three instances where the evaluations were negative but nothing further happened; they went to the next level and stopped there. He asked if any provision could be added into the procedures, so that faculty could appeal to higher levels in such cases. Senator Schooley replied that, from a pragmatic point of view, if a department head receives a negative review and his dean does nothing about it, then presumably the faculty of the college could call for an extraordinary review of the dean, based upon his or her failure to take action. At some point, he added, this would be embarrassing for a person's professional career, and he was not sure how much of a problem the above-described situation would be. Senator Garcia commented that that sort of embarrassment does not seem to have occurred very often at this institution. He pointed out that if a college has five departments and four of the departments generally are very satisfied with the dean, when one department has a problem with its head, it is unlikely that the other four departments would support an extraordinary review of the dean based upon his inaction with regard to the department head in question. Senator Schooley acknowledged that this is a potential problem, and he asked for suggestions. Senator Szilagyi strongly suggested that the last sentence in item #2 be retained as is (requiring a petition signed by only one-fifth of the constituent faculty in order to initiate an extraordinary review), because violation of the human dignity of even one person should not be tolerated. If four departments are extremely happy with an administrator and one department is unhappy, that is reason enough to call for an extraordinary review, he said; that is the basis of the First Amendment of the Constitution.

Senator J. O'Brien said he did not see evaluations as being punitive, but rather a way to shape, move, and confirm. He added that he would like to see language in shared governance procedures that would encourage evaluations by requiring them at least every five years, but allowing them more frequently.

Senator Neuman proposed that, in order to allow minorities to initiate extra reviews without causing instability, no more than one extraordinary review be allowed in between regular reviews.

Senator Witte commented that the issue would arise if the recommendation of the extraordinary review was not being followed. With regard to implementation, she added, she would like to see it based on something other than embarrassment. She also made several other points: (1) Departmental governance should come before, not after, structure elsewhere; if there is structure at the top, but chaos at the departmental level, with significant differences from college to college or unit to unit, that does not get to the heart of the problem. Rules and policies should be shaped

from the ground up and cannot be left until later. (2) Faculty are being asked to sit at the bargaining table with no bargaining chips other than a law that was passed on their behalf. (3) Separation of powers is important; faculty should meet among themselves to discuss issues and policies first, rather than meeting with administrators in hybrid committees from the beginning of the process. Faculty should have a chance to consider issues independently, rather than being given pre-digested views with only a short time to review them before a vote is taken. This undercuts the Faculty Senate and the faculty viewpoint. (4) With regard to the second sentence in item #7 of the shared governance draft, she recommended deleting the word "rare," so that the sentence would read, "Only on those occasions where mutual agreement between the faculty and the administration cannot be reached and where the President deems action clearly necessary in order to protect or advance interests vital to the University shall the President act unilaterally." A policy document should not predict how often a circumstance will occur, she said.

With regard to the provision for an extraordinary review, Senator Medine said he was not certain he agreed with Senator Sypherd's comment that a department could be placed into constant turmoil if as few as 20% of its faculty could require an extraordinary review; he said he did not think that this provision would result in such a circumstance very often. He added that his more than 25 years of experience on the UA faculty cause him to lean very heavily toward keeping the percentage at 20%, even at the departmental level. Faculty should regard themselves not in an adversarial position in relation to anyone else, but rather as professionals who have a responsibility to themselves, the University, and the state; they can be trusted to use the provision in an appropriate manner. Senator Feltham noted that if a department is in constant turmoil, there must be another problem there.

Senator Dyl asked if the APPC could gather data on how many University departments have ten or fewer faculty members, so that they could determine how often one or two faculty members could actually inflict their views on the majority of the department by using the 20% provision. Senator Schooley said that his committee had not yet looked at those statistics, but it was a good suggestion.

Senator Garcia commented that if 80% of a department's faculty is satisfied with the direction of the department and 20% is not, the majority will express themselves and tell the 20% to be quiet. Senator Medine said 20% is 20%.

Senator Atwater suggested that, if the 20% provision stays as is, some language could be added to limit the number of extraordinary reviews allowed between regular reviews, i.e., not allow a second extraordinary review during the five-year period unless the first one had not been dealt with satisfactorily. Senator Schooley expressed a concern that such an addition would give carte blanche to an administrator to become a dictator for the remaining four years of the cycle.

Senator Joens commented that for most of the reviews he had participated in, numbers were tabulated at the end of the process, and the minority opinion, whether positive or negative, was acknowledged at that time. The most difficult aspect of reviews is the implementation of the result, he added.

Senator Witte noted that occasionally the minority is in the right; those situations sometimes lend themselves to conciliation. Having a University group outside of the department review the situation and determine if a compromise can be reached would be preferable to continuing to activate the same mechanism without relief, she said.

Senator Aleamoni stressed that implementation will be the key. Whatever system is finally approved, the true measure of it will be whether it is implemented and then supported. We need to consider carefully how we construct this document, whether by its language or a system of checks and balances, to assure that implementation will occur. It has been his personal experience that implementation of policies has been a problem in the past, he concluded.

Senator Zwolinski commented that in item #2 there is a basis of mutual agreement of the faculty and the administrator superior to the individual in question. He said he hoped that after a review, either regular or extraordinary, the outcome would be mutually discussed and agreed upon by the superior administrator and the faculty group involved. That is where this document goes a step further than where we are now, he said; if it is adopted, we may be able to avoid having a review take place with no resultant implementation.

9. **REPORT ON CURRICULUM PROJECT** (Attachment)

Senator Warburton announced that Senators should have received two separate hand-delivered packets last week regarding the core curriculum proposal. He noted that today the Senate would be discussing the contents of the two packets, and action would be taken at a later meeting, hopefully the next meeting.

Dr. Ann Weekes, Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Committee, noted that Associate Vice Provost Susan Steele also planned to participate in the presentation, but had not yet arrived. Dr. Weekes began by listing the three areas she would be discussing: the rationale for a core curriculum; an examination of the original proposal and the modifications that have been made in it over the past two years; and an outline of the concerns that the ICPC has regarding the current proposal, which, she said, Dr. Steele could address.

The proposal for a University-wide general education core curriculum was developed in order to help students negotiate through the University, Dr. Weekes explained. Currently, because each college has different general education requirements, students who enroll in one college and later transfer to another college may have to take general education courses all over again. Since fewer than 20% of UA students graduate in the major they initially declare, a huge number of students are changing colleges and having to retake general education classes. Other motivating factors for developing a core curriculum are:

- **faculty stakes** - Since Arts and Sciences colleges develop and staff general education courses, faculty in other colleges have no input into the content or teaching of general education courses.
- **curricular complexity** - At the moment, it is very difficult for students to negotiate the various general education requirements.
- **institutional responsiveness** - It has proven difficult to forecast which general education classes will be required in any given semester, because of the different requirements in each college.
- **curricular coherence** - Because students currently can take their general education requirements across any level, there is no coherence in the courses they take, so they do not gain a systematic appreciation of an area of study.
- **pedagogical expectations** - General education requirements now are spread throughout the student's experience at the University; this means that faculty in advanced courses cannot rely on students having covered any common ground.
- **common intellectual experiences** - Having a core curriculum may assure that students graduating from the UA will have had some sort of typical University of Arizona experience.

Dr. Weekes briefly described the original core curriculum proposed two years ago, with all students taking foundations classes in composition, mathematics, and a second language. All students were to take the same six Tier One classes, which were to be completed by the end of the student's first year. Tier Two, also composed of six courses, was to be completed by the end of the student's second year. Dr. Weekes also showed a slide detailing the list of deliberations and meetings that have occurred regarding the core curriculum since October 1994; most recently there were weekly open forums during the summer of 1996. Revisions to the proposal were made after each round of input from faculty, administrators, and others. Early last fall, the Undergraduate Council sifted through unresolved issues related to the proposal and developed two possible structures for the core curriculum. The Undergraduate Council approved presenting these structures to the Provost, so that he could forward them to the colleges to be voted upon. In November 1996 the University-Wide General Education Committee reviewed the colleges' response and approved a proposal for a University-wide general education structure; this proposal was reviewed by the Undergraduate Council and approved with minor modifications. That version is the current proposal, which is contained in the packets distributed to Senators last week.

Dr. Weekes gave some detail about the foundations component of the program. Three strands of mathematics are proposed: the G strand is intended for students whose major requires only general knowledge and understanding of math; the M strand is for students who are expected to need a moderate knowledge in math; and the S strand is directed at students whose major requires substantial knowledge of math. With regard to composition, there are four possibilities: (1) a two-course sequence of English 101 and 102 or the ESL equivalents; (2) a two-course sequence of extended English 101 and English 102 or the ESL equivalents; (3) a two-course honors sequence of English 103h and English 104h; or (4) a one-semester course in combination with an AP score of 4 or 5 or a placement writing portfolio demonstrating advanced proficiency. The course would be English 109 initially, but other appropriate courses could be developed. In the area of a second language, fourth-semester skill level would be required for all B.A. degree programs, and second-semester skill level would be required for all non-B.A. programs.

In Tier One, Dr. Weekes continued, students would be asked to take six courses, two each in Traditions and Cultures, Individuals and Societies, and Natural Sciences; in Tier Two, they would take four courses, one each in Arts, Individuals and Societies, Humanities, and Natural Science. One course in Tier Two could be in the student's major area. Also, one course in a student's degree program must focus on non-western cultures or on race, gender, class, or ethnicity.

Dr. Weekes then described some modifications that had been made from the first core curriculum proposal to the second one.

- The idea of all freshmen students taking the same core courses has been abandoned, because it met with great opposition. The Tier One guidelines contain the idea that Tier One courses should be foundational, but they allow the possibility that the foundational courses may not be identical. The Tier Two guidelines move much farther in the direction of discipline-based courses.
- Regarding delivery, it is no longer expected that all Tier One and Tier Two courses will be delivered to classes of 150 students.
- Students will be expected to complete Tier One by the mid-point of their degree programs, rather than by the end of the first year. Tier Two should be completed by the end of the degree program.
- In the original proposal, the 1998 change in university entrance requirements to two years of a second language in high school was taken into consideration. Thus, the second-language requirement was established as a skill-level requirement rather than a seat-time requirement, and the expectation was set at a second-semester skill level, with the option that the majors might demand more. However, some faculty in Science, Humanities, and SBS did not think that a two-semester level was appropriate. A compromise was struck that all students with B.A. objectives would be required to demonstrate a fourth-semester skill level, while all other students would need to demonstrate a second-semester skill level. Further, if a student cannot demonstrate a second-semester skill level at entrance, he or she would then be required to take course work, the units for which would not count toward a major. This is consistent with the treatment of English 100 and Math 116; they would be counted as deficiencies.
- With regard to mathematics, initially it was thought there should not be a separate skills foundation area for math, but that it should be taught as part of the general education Tier One and Tier Two courses. However, it became clear through discussion that the varying levels of math skills for entering students would make that virtually impossible, and a compromise was reached with the three strands of mathematics described previously.
- There is still some conflict regarding the composition requirement. Many people believe that composition could best be dealt with by adding a one-unit writing requirement onto Tier One and Tier Two courses, while other people insist that the composition courses are necessary as courses in themselves. Under the current proposal, most students will be required to take two semesters of composition. However, there is the option of developing courses within Tier One to replace an independent composition course for well prepared students.
- Initially it was expected that all undergraduate students would share a single integrative science curriculum in Tier One. However, the College of Engineering and Mines expressed a concern that this would mean extra units for their students, because they need a more specialized science course in the first year. A compromise was reached that Engineering and Science majors could take chemistry and physics course work required for their degree to satisfy their first-year natural science requirement. Other technically based majors may also petition for a similar arrangement, with their dean's approval.
- Presently students in Science, Humanities, and SBS are required to take one course in non-western civilization and one in gender, race, class, or ethnicity; these colleges would like to see this requirement extended to the entire University. However, since other colleges felt they already had been given an increase and a two-course requirement would be too much, a compromise was reached that all University students would be required to take one course in either of the two categories just mentioned.
- The original proposal called for four courses distributed across two study areas in Tier Two. Many thought this was too demanding and that the number of science units was too high. Also, the College of Fine Arts had a concern that the college lacked any specific place in the curriculum. The compromise reached in this instance reduced the number of required courses outside the major in Tier Two from four to three; the number of courses in science in Tier Two was also reduced, from two to one. The new proposal also specifies a place for Fine Arts. Another change in Tier Two from the original proposal deals with the number of non-science courses required for students in Engineering and Mines and the School of Health-Related Professions: Because of the unit loads for their majors, they are required to take only two non-science courses in Tier Two—one course in Arts and Humanities and one in Individuals and Societies. Other majors with a comparable unit load may petition the University-Wide General Education Committee for a similar arrangement.

Dr. Weekes concluded her formal presentation on the core curriculum by discussing some concerns that the ICPC has with the proposal.

- **Implementation and resources** - The ICPC has specific concerns about the availability of (a) classes for students, (b) rooms of the appropriate size, (c) faculty, (d) teaching assistants, and (e) funds to pay for teaching assistants.
- **Lack of laboratory science in the general education science courses** - The committee strongly feels that there is no substitute for hands-on laboratory experience in a science course.

- **Arts and Humanities** - The ICPC feels that Arts and Humanities courses in both Tier One and Tier Two should be available simultaneously for students in those areas, so they would not need to complete Tier One before taking classes in Tier Two.
- **Articulation with community colleges** - Questions arose regarding articulation between the UA and community colleges if students enter the UA before completion of an A.A. degree. If they enter after completion of the A.A., there is no problem, since the general education requirements are considered completed with the A.A. degree.
- **Evaluation and assessment** - The committee strongly feels that the core curriculum should not be put into place until a system of evaluation and assessment can be established.

Senator Szilagyi commented that it is an insult to civilization to divide it into western and non-western civilization. Students should be required to know something about civilization in general, he said, not non-western civilization. He added that as a student in the Soviet Union, he was required to study Marxism and Leninism, as was everyone there. He stated that UA students will also have similar requirements, because these issues, especially raised in class, are subjects of Marxism and Leninism.

Senator Sypherd raised the issue about the number of students in the Tier courses. He applauded the efforts of the various faculty groups who have struggled with the concepts involved and have developed principles and objectives of the Tier One and Tier Two Courses. However, he noted, he remains concerned about the possible number of students in those courses. He asked if the committee would consider setting some lower limits. He stated the following facts: (1) The state appropriation to the universities will not change in the next decade or two. (2) The size of the UA faculty will continue to decrease. (3) The UA is not Cal Tech, with four faculty for every student, but rather a public institution with 27 students for each faculty member; that number will increase. Senator Sypherd noted that he continued to remain concerned about maintaining sufficient time for faculty to be involved in scholarly and creative work. Given that the number of faculty will decrease, the burden on the remaining faculty will increase. We must therefore continue to increase the minimum enrollment figures. When we are dealing with 4,500 students at the Tier One level at 150 students per class, that is 30 sections, or it would be 150 sections at 30 students per class. One of the problems today with 300-plus general education classes is that we have too many classes with too few students enrolled, Dr. Sypherd said. It is not economical for a public university to be engaged in this way. He added that, although he disliked making the discussion strictly fiduciary in nature, we do need to be concerned about preserving and enhancing what distinguishes the UA in this state: its status as the research university. He concluded by asking if there is some consideration of placing minimum enrollment requirements on the Tier One and Tier Two courses. Dr. Weekes responded that some faculty had concerns about teaching their courses to 150 students; certain faculty said that the appropriate number of students for their classes was 30-45. On the other hand, she added, there are courses that will accommodate 150 students. Dr. Janet Sturman, Chair of the University-Wide General Education Committee, commented that the committee had had proposals dealing with this issue in various ways, e.g., having large lecture sections with smaller discussion sections meeting once a week, or using technology in innovative ways that allow students to work in smaller groups and yet still meet in large sections for the principal instructor's duties. Thus, she noted, some of Senator Sypherd's concerns are being addressed by professors as they prepare the proposals for new classes. To Senator Sypherd's question about whether the University-Wide General Education Committee has developed a policy regarding minimum enrollment, Dr. Sturman replied that there is no strict policy the committee has been enforcing, although it certainly considers the numbers every time it reviews a course proposal and makes recommendations for accommodating more students, or for accommodating students in ways that both facilitate interaction in small groups and deal with professors' needs to have research time.

Senator Medine commented that we need to take into consideration the issues that Senator Sypherd raised. Another issue, he added, is that of space. He would be very willing to teach 450 students in a lower-division Shakespeare class, but there is not room to do so. How can we accommodate classes of this size? Senator Sypherd responded that we do not have the room only if everyone wants to teach between 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. He added that if the IIF Building is constructed, we will be able to accommodate classes of 150 students, recognizing that not all courses will have 150 students enrolled.

Senator Garcia asked if AP credit would be awarded for subjects other than composition; could a student place out of the natural science course by using AP credit? Dr. Weekes responded in the affirmative. Dr. Steele added that it depends on the course; if students can do AP physics now, for example, that will also be possible under the core curriculum plan. Senator Garcia also had a comment: The ICPC concerns that Dr. Weekes noted are exactly the ones he has, and he was pleased to see that they are being addressed. He highlighted one concern in particular—the question of laboratory experiences. Currently about 70% of all UA students take a laboratory course. What we are now proposing has no requirement for a laboratory course in the natural sciences. Two or three years ago there was a vote

of the faculty of science to determine if they wished to discontinue the requirement for a laboratory science. Two-thirds or more of the respondents indicated that they felt it was very important to have laboratory courses associated with the teaching of science. Many incoming UA students are concrete thinkers, he said, and hands-on laboratory experience is very much a part of students' maturing into becoming abstract thinkers. Nationwide surveys have been done that indicate that students appreciate having the laboratory experience, because they too recognize that it is one of the ways in which learning occurs. Moving from what we now have, with 70% of students taking lab courses, to requiring no lab courses, seems to be a regression rather than a good way for the UA to move into the future, Senator Garcia said. He added that he spent the last year at the National Science Foundation, where he reviewed many innovative laboratory programs being developed; traditional labs are being supplanted by truly exciting formats in which both concrete and abstract thinkers can learn a subject well. He concluded by saying that the Physics Department had just conducted its annual survey of undergraduate students currently in introductory laboratory courses; there was absolutely no sentiment for abolishing laboratory courses.

Senator Feltham had two comments: (1) When he reviewed the first core curriculum proposal, it was evident that it had been aimed at the lowest common denominator; it is good that there has been some progress away from that direction. The UA should not be in the business of having remedial courses, but there is still a large element of that thinking in the current core curriculum proposal. For the UA to maintain its quality in the face of dwindling resources and fewer faculty, one solution would be to raise the UA's entrance requirements. (2) All three of his own children have been UA students. All of them have changed majors and have taken longer than four years to graduate. The opportunity to do so has been to their benefit and has afforded them better preparation for their careers.

Senator Schiffer noted that he has been an outspoken critic of the core curriculum proposal since the beginning, primarily because of the manner in which it was presented as an administrative proposal. Along the way it has been refashioned to appear as though there has been a great deal of faculty input, but in reality there has been less faculty input than it would seem, he said. He then proposed obtaining a faculty referendum on the two core curriculum proposals. He moved [Motion 1996/97-37] that a referendum be distributed to all teaching faculty, asking them to choose among three options: core curriculum proposal #1, core curriculum proposal #2, or retention of the present general education system. He added that we need a referendum because, although input has been obtained from all units on campus, discussion in curriculum committees and elsewhere has centered on how to protect a given unit's equity in the system, given that the core curriculum will be implemented because the Provost wants it. There has been little discussion about whether this system will actually solve any problems, he concluded.

Senator Davis commented that he agreed with Senator Schiffer's suggestion, although he thought the motion was somewhat restrictive, because proposals #1 and #2 are so similar. We need a wider variety of proposals, he said. Essentially, faculty were asked whether they wanted a proposal that was not too good or one that was not quite so bad, so everyone voted for the latter when units were asked for their input. He asked Senator Schiffer to reconsider his motion to broaden it. He also suggested that the ICPC could look at a wider variety of generic proposals, such as a voluntary program or a collegial, cooperative arrangement; at the proper time, he noted, he would offer a motion proposing what they should consider. Any proposal needs a great deal of discussion, he added, not only of the new core concept, but also of the centralization aspect. In an era when the trend is toward decentralization and empowerment of individual units, and the University is telling faculty that this is working well, we have a proposal that calls for a centralized, compulsory core that covers at least 40% of undergraduate education requirements. We must evaluate all core curriculum proposals very carefully to ensure that most students' education is improved by them and that no student's education is degraded by them; we also need to consider the effect on a student's total education and the Arizona Board of Regents' desire for students to graduate in less time than they currently do. Senator Davis also noted that the core curriculum proposal will effect a growth in administration. He concluded by saying that we need to gather more student input regarding the core curriculum proposal.

The question arose whether there was a motion on the floor. Secretary Gerber reported that she had heard a motion from Senator Schiffer, but no clear second for that motion. Senator Schiffer reiterated his request that a rank-and-file vote of the teaching faculty be obtained on the core curriculum proposal. Seconds to the motion were verbalized at this point)

Senator Atwater pointed out that the core curriculum is not yet a definite proposal to be voted upon. She said she agreed with Senator Davis that Senator Schiffer's motion is too restrictive at this point. The purpose of today's discussion is to gain additional input and then to request even broader input from all constituents, not to force a vote on something that is not fully formed yet, she noted.

Parliamentarian Sankey clarified that a main motion is always in order during a discussion, unless the agenda specifically lists an item as being “for discussion only.” Since the agenda does not state this, Senator Schiffer’s motion is in order, he said.

Senator Warburton asked Senator Schiffer to repeat his motion. Senator Schiffer agreed, and he noted that he would try to modify it to take into account that these core curriculum proposals are continually evolving. Senator Schiffer moved [Motion 1996/97-37] that the Senate conduct a full teaching faculty referendum on the core curriculum, where faculty members are given a choice of the following three options: (1) proposal #1 as amended; (2) proposal #2 as amended; or (3) retention of the present general education system; motion seconded.

Senator Atwater made a point of order that there is no longer an original proposal #1 or proposal #2; a modified combination of the two proposals is what exists today and was just presented. Dr. Weekes concurred with that point.

Senator Warburton suggested that Senator Schiffer’s motion be restated to offer a choice between the modified core curriculum proposal or retention of the present general education system.

Senator Atwater expressed the opinion that voting in favor of Senator Schiffer’s motion now would close the door on providing additional ideas through open discussion of how to arrive at a core or general curriculum that addresses some rather compelling arguments that have been presented, such as the fact that 80% of undergraduate students change their majors. Student input should also be obtained and incorporated into an amended proposal, she said. The proposal presented today is not considered final; it was brought to the Senate for discussion. To present this to the faculty in contrast to the old seems to narrow the possibilities and not allow for further dialog, discussion, and change, she added.

Senator Schiffer asked Senator Atwater how she would propose to obtain faculty input prior to taking a vote on the proposal. Senator Atwater replied that the proposal could be sent out to faculty, with an invitation for input.

Senator Witte made a point of order. She asked whether Senator Schiffer would consider a friendly withdrawal of his motion, because it appears premature. It would be better to re-enter it at the next Senate meeting, she said. Once the document has been amended, it will be appropriate to have a vote. She noted that there appears to be a great deal of support for the spirit of Senator Schiffer’s amendment, but there also seems to be a consensus that we should have a better document before it is sent out to the faculty for their further input, approval, or whatever. Senator Schiffer said he would withdraw his motion, as long as it will not be considered for a Faculty Senate vote at the next meeting. Senator Warburton commented that the core curriculum proposal could be brought forward as a seconded motion, but not necessarily voted upon.

Senator Clarke said that he felt certain that the core curriculum proposal would be defeated if it were voted upon now. However, we added, we know that there is a problem with the current curriculum, and we have to deal with it. Keeping things the way they are is not a good idea. None of the proposals deals with the issue of class size. We are graduating a number of students who have not learned to write (as evidenced by the results of the Upper-Division Writing Proficiency Exams), or who are illiterate in science, or who have not learned much history. Senator Clarke expressed the opinion that the reason students are not learning better is that there is very little interaction between students and qualified faculty. He reiterated Provost Sypherd’s comment earlier in the semester that the major concerns parents have about their children’s UA education are interaction with the faculty and class size. The best institutions in the country focus on class size—not always at the introductory level, but certainly at the senior level—and the UA is not doing that. Given the gloomy forecast with respect to faculty positions and enrollments, the administration should consider allocating faculty positions according to student enrollments more closely than it has in the past, in order to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience. Although there are other functions that the University has to perform as well, the issue of allocating faculty has to be addressed in any plan to change the curriculum, Senator Clarke concluded.

Senator Garcia commented that a similar discussion had been held at the University in the early 1980s concerning the general education requirements in place at that time in the College of Arts and Sciences. A faculty vote was taken then, and a proposal for the general education program that we now have was approved. The problem then was the same as a potential one that has already been discussed regarding the core curriculum proposal: the implementation of the resources to follow the track. In the prior instance, resources did not follow the general education track, and departments were mandated student loads that they simply could not handle. Thus, students could not take the courses they needed to graduate. Eventually, the entire general education system was bastardized to allow any possible course to count toward general education requirements; because of the implementation and resource problems, we now have a general education system with more than 300 courses in it. No one—not students, faculty, or administrators—likes the

general education program we now have. Senator Garcia said he hoped that when Senator Schiffer brings his motion back to the Senate floor, he will include an option for a modification of the current general education system, perhaps one that returns to the original design within the current system constructs. He also noted that transferring across colleges will never be totally seamless and should not be; what we should strive for is to make the process less painful for students.

Senator Levy commented that whatever happens with the core curriculum proposal, the University will never have more resources than it currently has to do it. He added that we cannot consider class independently of other issues, including other faculty responsibilities. The total number of students enrolled in the University implies a total number of student credit hours; the student/faculty ratio mandated by the state requires that there be a certain map of teaching per semester per student credit hour. If we are all going to do that in 25-student classes, that means that we are each going to teach four or five classes per semester. We need to recognize that there are real-world, unavoidable constraints that influence this situation. As much as we would like to do things differently, as much as we would like to teach in small classes, we do not have the resources to do that, and we cannot generate the resources to do that by waving some magic wand, he concluded.

Senator Anderson stated that her department was severely affected by the implementation of the general education requirements. Consequently, her course load did not increase, but her student load did, up to 90 students per class. While it is no doubt true that we have very restricted resources for dealing with general education, she noted, it is also true that in those very years that general education was being implemented, the students were moving in one direction, while faculty lines and other dollars were moving in other directions, and no one has been willing to accept responsibility for that. The administration most responsible for it is no longer in power, but even today we are unwilling to admit that certain departments, particularly in certain colleges, were overburdened with students, but nothing was done about reallocation. Many faculty live with that reality today, she added. Also, because of such poor planning for the first general education program, many students were unable to get the classes they needed. This situation helped to create a political backlash against the University, as students complained to their parents and parents went to the legislature. If we do not want to repeat those mistakes, we are ill-advised to establish a new core curriculum system whose impact in terms of our resources to implement it has not been seriously examined. We should have impact statements at the departmental level to anticipate which departments will be expected to shoulder what part of the burden. Since the beginning of the core curriculum discussion, she stated, she has been very upset because it has been so administration-generated and pushed. If there is any place in the University where faculty are supposed to have authority, it is over curriculum, and that has been abridged badly in this process, she said. She concluded by saying that it is her sense that we should start over, although that would be quite an unpopular proposal.

Senator Schooley stated that he would like to endorse the ideas heard previously about the committee strongly suggesting a core curriculum of choice, rather than of compulsion. He briefly discussed the effect of the second-language requirement on his college, the College of Engineering and Mines. Most engineers do not need a second language; almost all of the international professional engineering conferences are held in English; all the engineering journals are translated to English. It is much more important for engineers to understand computer languages than to speak a foreign language. If a second language is mandated by the core curriculum proposal, the UA College of Engineering and Mines will no longer be competitive, because no other engineering school in the nation requires a second language, and the UA will lose potential engineering students to ASU, NAU, or California. The College of Engineering and Mines cannot meet its professional obligations and accreditation requirements and do some of things proposed in the core curriculum. On the other hand, he noted, some engineering students want to gain true competence in a second language, and they should have the opportunity to do so within the humanities and social science framework, if they choose to do so. We could rethink the core curriculum in terms of offering a limited smorgasbord of courses; then the individual disciplines could choose which requirements are appropriate for their own professional curricula, rather than having them mandated by a central authority.

Senator Witte asked Dr. Weekes to prepare answers to the following questions, for presentation to the Senate at a future meeting:

- (1) Why are we doing this? We know what Provost Sypherd thinks the rationale is, but what is the ICPC's rationale, in something other than two-word combinations?
- (2) What exactly are we doing? The proposal has been through many changes; can you explain in a half-page what is different about the proposal from what we have now?
- (3) How would we know if we did it, or if we did it right, or if it was good, rather than just acceptable?

- (4) How much will this proposal cost, not only in terms of money, buildings, and resources, but also in number of students lost who might have attended the UA?

Senator Feltham said he agreed with Senator Levy's assessment of the economic situation as it is being dealt with and as described by the Provost. However, there is a problem that we do not have the opportunity to address that directly impacts the situation, he noted. If a proposal before the state legislature is implemented as requested, we will have spent approximately \$10 million on the Arizona International Campus by the end of this coming fiscal year. Another waste of money is trying to use the most expensive type of construction for the IIF; building underground will add millions of dollars to the capital cost, he said. Even though in principle operating costs will be lower, ASU has an underground library that has major problems. There are many examples of wasteful spending, both large and small. The problem is not the faculty or the course size; some of the problem is institutional requirements, but most of it is wasteful spending by the administration, without any consideration for students, faculty, staff, or the taxpayers, he concluded.

Senator Davis stated that now might be the appropriate time for him to present the motion he mentioned earlier. He displayed an overhead slide with the following motion [Motion 1996/97-38]:

In its report to the Faculty Senate ICPC should determine, among other things, the following:

1. The objectives and goals of a university-wide general education requirement.
2. Whether a mandatory general education requirement would be beneficial to all students or if the quality and content of some students' education would be degraded.
3. Whether the objectives and goals of general education could be met by a cooperative collegial general education requirement comprised of those elements on which the college and faculty have reached consensus.
4. The views of students from all the colleges and the ASUA concerning the effect of the current general education proposals on students.

ICPC to report to the Faculty Senate during its March meeting.

Motion seconded.

Senator Schwarz suggested that the ICPC return to the Senate when it feels ready. Dr. Weekes noted that item #3 in Senator Davis' motion might entail a full year's work; she also asked who should be polled for that question, to which Senator Davis replied she could start with the ICPC members and expand from there.

Senator Silverman said he did not know how items #2 and 3 could be addressed. Although items #1 and 4 are doable, he said, he was not sure it is feasible or fair to ask the ICPC to address items #2 and 3.

Senator Levy spoke against the motion. This subject has been under discussion at the University for almost two and a half years. Despite what many may think about the quality of the discussion, the faculty has been rather strongly focused on the subject. There also has been discussion in departments, colleges, department head meetings, and college and department curriculum committees. There has been an enormous amount of give-and-take between the administration and the faculty on this proposal, he added. This motion would simply set all that aside, circumventing what has been a difficult but rather collegial battle, out of which has surfaced a surprisingly crystallized proposal. For this body to consider pushing everything aside and starting anew is perplexing, he concluded.

Senator Emrick said the answer to item #2 in the motion is clearly no. Whenever a system is changed, it is going to benefit some and harm others. The question is whether it will benefit more than the current disarray. He noted that he has been in favor of this change, mainly because of the current state of affairs. What seems to be important in terms of choice is what courses are offered under each of the categories and how the courses are structured. Both core curriculum proposals are merely frameworks and not definite schemes of courses. He concluded by saying he thought the effort ought to be invested in providing suitable courses in each one of those categories.

Senator Atwater said there seem to be fairly large areas of agreement about the proposal. Tier Two seems to be the area where there is a problem. We have a great deal of information in the ICPC packet, and along with whatever additional information the ICPC can provide in January, we can add it to the pool of information that we want the General Faculty

to react to. That would be preferable to almost starting afresh, she noted, and she was therefore against Senator Davis' motion.

Senator Medine said he also wanted to speak, somewhat reluctantly, against the motion. Senator Levy isolated a number of points that are true. We have to recognize that we are facing an enormous problem, and that is a tradition for at least the last two administrations of not being able to support as handsomely as most faculty would like the instructional obligations that we have. Having said that, there is much that is inefficient and undesirable in the so-called reforms of the early 1980s that Senator Garcia referred to earlier. All we can do now is to try to provide for creative solutions to the individual problems that we have and which we must force the administration to recognize. One of those problems is space; we will not have a new IIF building for at least three or four years. If the College of Engineering and Mines and perhaps other colleges have a problem with one area of the proposal, can we not resolve it, rather than discarding all of the work that has already been done? Senator Medine concluded by saying that he was against the initial core curriculum proposal, but is very impressed with the current proposal and what faculty committees have developed. Although he could not support a proposal that a college could not live with, he said, we are not very far about on this issue and we should work toward some resolution of it.

Senator J. O'Brien said he did not think the ICPC has the resources to answer the questions in Senator Davis' motion, even though the answers might be instructive. He also noted that he is concerned about some of the language in the proposal; it is no longer a core curriculum, but rather a core experience. His greatest concern, he said, is how will we accomplish this? He is in a department where four faculty out of 50 generate 55% of the credit units. We have not solved the implementation issues, and we do not know what it will cost or who will do it.

Senator Witte noted that this is the first time this document has come to the Senate floor, and Senators must have time to review it and then be able to ask questions. We will not be moving forward if we vote; we will just be moving into chaos. We must take our time on this issue, she said.

Senator Davis said he had made the motion to facilitate discussion. Contrary to what Senator Levy said, there has not been a good debate on this issue. There have been faculty committees working on the core curriculum proposal, but there have not been faculty governance committees reviewing the proposal until very recently. There actually have been 11 committees reviewing the proposal, but two committees were never asked to give a report. If one of those committees, the committee for changing expectation for majors in professional schools, had given a report, perhaps there would not be such a problem now. He concluded by saying that his motion may be too general for some people, but the idea was to say that maybe the ICPC could help facilitate discussion by looking at a broader range of topics.

Senator Neuman said he supported Senator Davis' motion. He said he saw questions #2 and 3 as essentially rhetorical, and he agreed that the answers to them are obvious. However, he said, he was not sure that the obvious answers had been taken into account when the proposals were prepared. The ICPC needs to acknowledge that (1) there is a very clear answer to these questions; (2) the current general curriculum is problematic; and (3) that what the Senate has been given to review thus far may not be the right solution. What we need is a better organized, yet more flexible solution than what we have in the proposal, he concluded.

Senator Garcia said he hoped that the maker of the motion would withdraw it now that it has had the desired effect. He said the Senate should debate the issue as long as necessary, in order to avoid making another mistake like the one in the 1980s that he described earlier. He asked why a vote in January is mandated on the core curriculum proposal, to which Dr. Weekes replied that a year of transition is needed in order to assess the numbers of classes, faculty, and resources required. Senator Garcia said that the Senate may not be able to meet that time schedule.

Senator Davis said that he would be willing to amend his motion to delete items #2 and 3 and to allow the ICPC to report back to the Senate when it is ready. He added, however, that he would definitely like to obtain student input and to have the objectives and goals of a university-wide general education requirement detailed.

Senator Warburton called for the question. Motion 1996/97-38, as amended by the maker, defeated, with 12 votes in favor and 14 opposed.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Appendix*

1. "Campus in Every County" College of Agriculture brochure
2. Consent Agenda Items for Senate Meeting on December 2, 1996
3. Promotion and Tenure Statistics, Actions Taken in 1995-96 To be Effective in 1996-97
4. Shared governance draft (with cover memo from L. Schooley dated 11/4/96)
5. Proposal for a University-Wide General Education Program and related materials

*Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.

Motions of the Meeting of December 2, 1996

- 1996/97-34 A motion to change the name of the School of Library Science to the School of Information Resources and Library Science. Motion carried.
- 1996/97-35 A motion to change the name of the M.A. in German to the M.A. in German Studies. Motion carried.
- 1996/97-36 A motion to ask the Academic Personnel Policy Committee to gather additional information regarding the two promotion and tenure cases in which the President has overturned a negative decision, in order to determine if this sort of process is fair to departments and is in conformity with grievance policies and faculty guidelines; motion carried.
- 1996/97-37 A motion that a referendum be distributed to all teaching faculty, asking them to choose among three options: core curriculum proposal #1, core curriculum proposal #2, or retention of the present general education system; motion amended by maker (see below).
A motion that the Faculty Senate conduct a full teaching faculty referendum on the core curriculum, where faculty members are given a choice of the following three options: proposal #1 as amended; proposal #2 as amended; or retention of the present general education system. Motion withdrawn.
- 1996/97-38 A motion that the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee, in its report to the Faculty Senate regarding the core curriculum proposal, should determine, among other things, the following: (1) the objectives and goals of a university-wide general education requirement; (2) whether a mandatory general education requirement would be beneficial to all students or if the quality and content of some students' education would be degraded; (3) whether the objectives and goals of general education could be met by a cooperative collegial general education requirement comprised of those elements on which the college and faculty have reached consensus; and (4) the views of students from all the colleges and the ASUA concerning the effect of the current general education proposals on students. ICPC to report to the Faculty Senate during its March meeting. Motion amended by maker (see below).
Motion amended to delete items #2 and #3 and to remove the March reporting time. Motion defeated.