

E E  
E

---

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.

Welcome to the emergency session of Academic Assembly. One member is not present; they will vote via email.

There are five motions on the table.

: To Approve/Disapprove #1 Core Curriculum Learning Objectives (from section 2 of UCRC report).

- a. I presented all five motions to Science & Engineering and the first motion was the most supported. Approximately 30 supported and 3 opposed.
- b. I propose that we approve the core curriculum learning objectives.
- c. 16 in favor, 1 abstention. The motion has passed.

: To Approve/Disapprove #2 Core Curriculum Model (from section 3 of UCRC report).

- a. 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. 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. 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. important to separate the vote on the particular proposed from the discussion of implementation.

g.

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.

2. 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. We already just approved the core model. Why would we then release it back to the university for a vote?
4. 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. 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.