

**Academic Assembly
Emergency Meeting
April 18, 2011
1:30-2:30pm, STCN 130**

MINUTES

Present: Brenda Broussard, Chips Chipalkatti, Isiaah Crawford, Andrew Davis, Karen Feldt, Paul Fontana, Francisco Guerrero, Joseph Harrison, Allison Heirich, Sonora Jha, Chuck Lawrence, Mark Maddox, Jacquelyn Miller, David Reid, Rob Rutherford, Kristen Shuyler, Jeremy Stinger, John Strait, John Weaver, Jason Wirth.

Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes.

- 1) Welcome to the emergency session of Academic Assembly. One member is not present; they will vote via email.
- 2) There are five motions on the table.
- 3) **Motion 1:** To Approve/Disapprove #1 Core Curriculum Learning Objectives (from section 2 of UCRC report).
 - a. *Rob Rutherford:* I presented all five motions to Science & Engineering and the first motion was the most supported. Approximately 30 supported and 3 opposed.
 - b. *Chips Chipalkatti:* I propose that we approve the core curriculum learning objectives.
 - c. **Vote on Motion 1:** 16 in favor, 1 abstention. The motion has passed.
- 4) **Motion 2:** To Approve/Disapprove #2 Core Curriculum Model (from section 3 of UCRC report).
 - a. *John Strait:* Core revisions always involve some “turf conflicts.” The objections to the proposed core are not ultimately persuasive. Although I would prefer to see more history and government structure, I recognize the payoffs of the flexible core. I defer to the committee proposal.
 - b. *Paul Fontana:* The core committee’s work is appreciated. I am concerned about passing a core that has less than enthusiastic support from the faculty. For something that is as fundamental to what we do as the core, passing without flying colors is problematic. The suggestion that was made in the minority committee report to pass the core model as it is except for the module 1 (Humanities) and module 3 (Humanities and Global Engagement) would address these faculty concerns.
 - c. *Nalini Iyer:* UCRC received formal petitions from History and English departments asking that the two disciplines be mandated in the Core. UCRC discussed these petitions in depth. Furthermore, since January, UCRC has discussed and voted on the history/English matter 3 times and each time the majority of the committee rejected the idea of mandating either discipline. Hence, the minority report.
 - d. *Jason Wirth:* To what extent are we worried about the credibility of the core if there is a substantial portion of A&S faculty that feel like their concerns have not been aired?
 - e. *Chips Chipalkatti:* There seem to be more people worried about implementation than about the specifics of English and history.
 - f. *Karen Feldt:* It is important to separate the vote on the particular core structure proposed from the discussion of implementation.
 - g. *William Kangas:* I support most of this but there are issues that I would like to see revised. I am less interested in the number of faculty who raise reservations than I am in the substance of the reservations. The implementation and the core outcomes are my

real concerns. Implementation is a critical issue in terms of the financing and the number of faculty hired. My biggest fear is a strong core that fails at the beginning. Prior to this new core there was another new core that failed because there was not enough funding. We should consider the FSA proposal that we take the rest of spring quarter to address the major concerns and also put off implementation for a year.

- h. *Karen Feldt*: We are not voting on the 2011 timeline today, we are only voting to approve the core and the learning objectives.
 - i. *Nalini Iyer*: This is the base structure. If there is no agreement on the 4 modules and the learning objectives, we cannot work on the timeline. There will be an implementation team separate from the UCRC that will deal with infrastructure and implementation.
 - j. *Isiaah Crawford*: This core launch is the highest priority for the President, Executive Team, and Academic Affairs. I cannot speak to failure of previous core a few decades ago. The resources will be brought forward to implement this core as it is expected from faculty. The timeline goal for implementation is fall of 2012. The implementation team would report back to AcA on a regular basis and perhaps offer a formal report by October or November 2011 on the viability of launching the core by fall 2012. That faculty group has the power to determine if we should hold off until fall 2013.
 - k. *Mark Maddox*: The overwhelming impression from students is excited. They view the current core as a series of hoops to jump through. Students are really excited by the design of module 1 because they can engage with a professor within their own specialty. The group of students against the core is a visible minority but they seem to be rebels for the sake of it. Overall, students are a 4 or 5 in terms of support.
 - l. *Rob Rutherford*: Surveying our college, they are 70/30 in support, but also 70/30 in support of taking more time.
 - m. *Paul Fontana* moves to endorse the FSA recommendation to approve the core module by UCRC with the exception of modules 1 and 3, and increase emphasis on history and literature. The motion is seconded. **Vote on FSA recommendation**: 4 in favor, 12 opposed, 1 abstention. The recommendation has not passed.
 - n. Call to vote on Motion 2 as it stands. Move to paper vote is seconded and unanimously approved. **Paper vote on Motion 2**: 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention. The motion has passed.
- 5) **Motion 3**: That the Academic Assembly organize and sponsor fora for discussion across the university about the core revision proposal; **Motion 4**: That the Academic Assembly sponsor a university-wide vote on the core revision proposal; and **Motion 5**: That the Academic Assembly seek to extend the timeline for the core design phase until the end of spring quarter.
- a. *John Strait*: I am troubled by the criticisms about process. This process has been very open since the beginning. Motion 3 is entirely redundant to what has taken place. Motion 4 is unclear. Does university-wide include faculty, staff, and/or administration? Motion 4 is a delaying tactic undermines university governance. The implementation organizational structure described by the Provost is going to require extensive feedback from AcA as well as all faculty.
 - b. *John Strait* moves to reject Motion 3; the move is seconded. Move to paper vote is seconded. **Paper vote on Motion 3**: 2 in favor, 14 opposed, 1 abstention. The motion has not passed.
 - c. Motion 4 and 5 are called to the table for discussion.
 - 1. Motion 4 is moved to be a paper vote.

2. *Isiaah Crawford*: I am concerned that voting on this motion undermines the inherent element of the core revision being a collaborative process of faculty, staff, and students.
 3. *Karen Feldt*: We already just approved the core model. Why would we then release it back to the university for a vote?
 4. *Isiaah Crawford*: The individual who put forward the motion can rescind the motion. If the decision would be to bring this forward for university wide vote after the AcA has already approved the structure for the new core, it would damage the credibility of the AcA to the faculty, staff, and executive leadership. I strongly recommend that we do not move forward in this way. The long term work that this body has done will be perhaps irrevocably damaged.
 5. *Jason Wirth*: I do not want to rescind the vote because of a need for clarity and purpose. However, given the pressure I am under, I will rescind Motion 4 and Motion 5. **Motion 4 and Motion 5 are rescinded and do not move to vote.**
- 6) All five motions were either voted on or rescinded. The emergency Academic Assembly meeting is over, and there will be a brief executive session immediately following.