Note: Please get agenda items for the June 3 Senate meeting to Birgo Bowers, English, by 5 pm. Thursday, May 21.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
May 6, 1998

OVERVIEW:

Major topics presented/discussed: the Natural Science requirement in the proposed GDR model; whether to require a Natural Science course for associate degree students; which goals to include in the Societies and Institutions category; whether to add Personal and Social Responsibility to the areas listed in category F; whether to refer the GER model back to the ASC

Actions:
1. A motion to require three courses in the Natural Science category (back page of the April 22 agenda) was defeated (p. 3 of the May 6 minutes).
2. A motion that at least one of the GER courses required of associate degree students be in the Natural Science area was defeated (p. 3 of these minutes).
3. A motion to include goal 6 as a possibility under the Societies and Institutions category was defeated (p. 3 of these minutes).
4. A motion to include Personal and Social Responsibility in the areas listed in category F was defeated (p. 4 of these minutes).
5. A motion to remove from the table amendment 2 from page 3 of the March 6 Senate minutes (concerning the number of courses in categories B, C, and D) was defeated (p. 5 of these minutes).
6. A motion to refer the GER model back to the ASC with a specific charge carried (p. 13 of these minutes).

CALL TO ORDER:

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

Minutes of the 22 April 1998 meeting were approved as distributed.

CHARTER & BYLAWS COMMITTEE: No report.

REPORT FROM THE SENATE CHAIR: Jim Morrison made the following announcements:

- The Senate Executive Committee will meet next week to start assigning members to standing Senate committees. Anyone who has not entered the committee preference form should do so immediately and advise multiple committees. The Charter & Bylaws stipulate that each committee must have representation from each college. Since A&H is the largest college, it may take several years for some individuals in A&H, particularly, to get on a committee.

ELECTIONS AND BALLOTING COMMITTEE: No report, Jim Morrison announced that elections for senators should be going on.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE:

Morrison noted that we would take up business with the ASC's report concerning recommendation 1 from the GER Task Force, the model as amended to date. Since Charles Slegler was on his way back from Toledo, Morrison began the discussion.

Allen Hunter, speaking for the Departments of Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Physics, and Astronomy, moved amendment 4 on the back of the April 22 agenda:

I move that the minimum number of sciences credit hours in the natural sciences be increased with the requirement that all bachelor's degree students take three GER courses in the Natural Science area.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed:

Hunter: Under the current GER model, the number of natural sciences courses required for most students will drop a substantial decrease. In the context of that, we would like to note that several national reports have come out in the last two or three months noting that American students are at the bottom of the industrial world in their knowledge of natural science.

Bill Jenkins: The number of Natural Science courses is not limited to 2-3; it could be 3 or even 4 if Category F (Selected Topics and Electives) is included. The GER Task Force worked hard to keep a rough balance among these courses. If the Natural Science area were to obtain the 3 courses under this motion, either Artistic and Literary Perspectives or the Societies and Institutions category would have to be limited to 2 courses. If people feel there is a need for more courses, the whole package needs to be reexamined.

Noam Khazaoji: While other Dr. Jenkins said is correct, one needs to look at the operational requirement: we require 12 hours of math and science now. The rule majority of students who are not required to take math do not take math and therefore take 12 hours of science. Perhaps this is why the GER Task Force made math a separate requirement. If we say that students could take 3 courses in the natural sciences because the model allows that, what would happen operationally is that only those who are mandated by other requirements would end up taking the 3.

What we are proposing in the present GER model is perhaps not the right direction and not the right step. When I look at state institutions with which we share resources and students—and with which we compare ourselves—we are proposing the lowest natural science requirement in the state, not only in terms of the number of hours but also as a proportion of the total GER package.

If we take the total 45 hours, or 15 courses, proposed for the GER model and consider that we are proposing a minimum of 13% of that number for the natural sciences, no other institution in the state requires such a small percentage in the sciences. The requirement statewide ranges from a high of 27% at Ohio State to 21% to 20%, with an average of more than 22% and a median number of 8 semester hours. We are reducing both the number of hours and the percentage of hours in the natural sciences.

Tom Mandlin: I would like to reinforce the idea that the Natural Science category needs to be considered as interdependent with the areas it is linked to. People in other areas would like to have more hours, too. We can all point to studies that show students do not get as much of a particular subject as they should. If we increase the requirement in one category, we automatically decrease the requirement in others and put those below the state averages. I would encourage us to vote the proposed amendment down and consider an alternative amendment that would deal with the entire set of requirements.

Frank Krygowski: If we reduce these other areas, will we be below the state averages in these?

Mandlin: I don't have the exact answer, but I suspect that 2 courses in Societies and Institutions, for instance, would be below what is required in any other state university in Ohio.

Jenkins: It would also be below what our own institution expects/sees. In trying to wrestle with this, the task force tried to provide some flexibility and give students some choices. It is important not to vote on the basis of this one issue; we need to consider the balance among areas and back at the impact of any changes on the whole GER.

Khazaoji: A science look does not suggest that we have the same disproportional representation in other areas. The Natural Science category stands out like a sore thumb.

Jeanette Gore: A good balance would be a curriculum required of all students that would make them intelligent voters and help them understand the issues of energy and the world around them. Achieving that goal increasingly requires a minimal understanding of chemistry, biology, and some simple physics concepts. To be honest as having the lowest requirement in the state would not be beneficial to YSU.

Jenkins: In regard to the data that Dr. Khazaoji had, I had looked at it early on and noted that it includes other areas as well. I don't think it is representative for one particular area.

A voice vote and hand vote were taken, and the motion to require 3 courses in the Natural Science category was defeated by a vote of 23 for the motion, 59 opposed.

======

Hunter: I would like to move our next amendment: number 5 on the back of the April 22 agenda:

I move that at least one of the GER courses required of associate degree students be in the Natural Science area.

Most associate degree students are in the College of Health and Human Services, and some of those programs now require biology and/or chemistry. This would not be much additional burden.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed:

Jenkins: The recommendations concerning associate degree students evolved because representatives of programs that offer associate degrees came forward and told us what they thought was appropriate for the degrees. I assume that since many of the associate degrees are in science areas, science courses will be recommended. I do not see any real problem here. Areas that are not scientific might want to have some choices for their students since their programs are only 2-3 year curriculums.

Louise Focke: Lose chair of Human Ecology, and we have several 2-year or associate degree programs. To designate that students must take a natural science limits what the students can take. We have to depend on the good thinking of advisors in particular departments. With programs of only 2-3 years, there are not many courses to begin with. We would make it almost impossible for students to finish the degree in two years.

A vote was taken, and the motion that at least one of the GER courses required of associate degree students be in the Natural Science area was defeated.

======

Rochelle Ruffer: On behalf of the Economics, Sociology & Anthropology, and Political Science Departments, I would like to make a motion from the back page of the April 8 Senate agenda, concerning section D, Societies and Institutions:

I move that we replace the language "A minimum of 12 and no more than 15[1-6] courses from a list of courses that meet goal 1 and, in addition, goal 10 or 12[*]" with the following language: "A minimum of 2 and no more than 3 [1]-[6] courses that meet the following criteria. One course must meet goal 11 and either goal 10 or 12. The second and third courses must meet goal 11 and at least one of the following goals: 6, 10, or 12.*"

We are asking that goal 6 be included as a possibility for these courses, but to ensure that students meet the diversity goal, one of the courses they take from this area would still have to meet goal 11 and either goal 10 or goal 12.

As we were thinking about good general education courses to offer, not specific to one department, many of the courses did not necessarily speak to diversity across countries, which is goal 10, or diversity within the United States, which is goal 12. Instead, they were related to goal 6 (understanding scientific method, forming and testing hypotheses, evaluating results). In courses like economics, we often learn about forming and testing hypotheses. In our rationale on the back of the April 8 agenda, we mentioned a course in Presidential Economics based on Herbert Stein's book Presidential Economics, which talks about the interplay between economic policy and politics in a manner good for a first-year student. Students would come away with an understanding of economists, some understanding of history, and some understanding of how economic policy is determined. If that is not a gen ed course, I don't know what is. The problem is that the course would not specifically meet goal 10 or 12, but it would meet goal 6.

The motion was seconded, and discussion followed:

Paul Sears: I speak in favor of this amendment. The Senate earlier decided not to change the name of the Societies and Institutions category to Social Science, which if we looked around the state might be a more accurate designation. All this amendment does is to allow students to count traditional social science classes under Societies and Institutions. It does not say that social science is all students would have to take to fulfill the requirement, but it would allow students to take such a course. Students ought to be allowed to do that. We would eliminate many free courses if we do not pass this amendment.

Hunter: Would this result in a substantial decrease in the diversity requirement? The diversity requirement already seems a little weak. The wording of the motion says "second and third courses," but the third course is optional. Should the motion say "and/or"?

Ruffer: Our courses for diversity was the reason for saying that one of the courses has to include diversity. Focusing on diversity is possible within any of the areas. I imagine that many courses in the other areas that do not have diversity as a stated goal will still have diversity as a goal. An honest answer is that we are going from a possibility that a student would have two definite diversity courses to one required diversity course.

Gingles: I am not speaking for or against the motion but just to bring this to your attention: the current language before you does not specify that goal 6 be included, but it also does not preclude it. Departments that want to include goal 6 in their courses may offer such courses. When they do, they can interpret the language in the proposed amendment to that you mention goals 10 and 12 or secondary goals. Goal 11 will remain a primary goal, with 10 and 12 behind it. In the second course, goal 11 is still the primary goal, but you can include 10 and 12 entirely.

Sears: What you said is true. However, goal 11, as we I understand, was the primary goal of Societies and Institutions, so you are not really changing that. I keep hearing discussions of politics here. I assume that since goal 11 is the goal that talks about politics, you want students to understand political institutions. That makes goal 11 central. What we try to do in political science is to teach political institutions in a scientific way. Whether that meets diversity goals depends on how strictly you define "diversity." Any study of American politics is going to include diversity. We will obviously mention the Civil Rights movement and things like that, if that is what you mean by diversity. I am confused as to what we mean by diversity, and perhaps we should have a more specific discussion of it. In fairness, this does not change the understanding, at least that I had, of the Societies and Institutions area.

Rob Levin: This amendment is a clear call. I appreciate the ideas that the social sciences folks are bringing forward. From the perspective of a teacher education, I would like to underscore the comment that diversity is not a central part of our mission here and such an uphill struggle, as we see very dramatically in the College of Education. The language in this proposal is not highly detailed and cannot be, but I like the message written into this proposal that diversity needs to be a consideration in these courses even if they are relatively traditional social science courses. I also think the ASC proposal already offers the flexibility to have courses that are strong in the disciplinary traditions of the social sciences. We cannot precisely define diversity, but I think the message is here that diversity needs to be a consideration. I would be more comfortable voting down the proposed amendment but with the confidence that there is probably ample flexibility in the ASC proposal, as it is, for the social science folks to be able to do most of what they wish to do.

Sears: Perhaps you may, in one and our cannot define diversity, how are we going to teach it? Can you define diversity so that we have precisely what we are going to have to offer in our political science classes to make sure that we are meeting this goal?

A voice vote and a hand vote were taken, and the motion to include goal 6 as a possibility for one or two courses under Societies and Institutions was defeated by a vote of 24 for the motion, 32 opposed.

======

Louise Focke: I move that we amend category F, Selected Topics and Electives, by deleting the word "and" before "societies and institutions" and adding "and personal and social responsibility." I think it is a simple and not an argumentative amendment. Right now, category F limits students' choices. (See the rationale in Appendix A.) The amended passage would read:

Students must take 1 course in this area from a list of courses that combine the goals in ways that do not fit into the areas above. Alternatively, a student may select one General education approved course from mathematics, natural sciences, artistic and literary perspectives, societies and institutions, and personal and social responsibility.

The motion was seconded and discussion followed:

Floyd Hagner: Discussion of category F is long overdue. Category F serves no purpose. The purpose of general education requirements is to change what people take. The GER have to impact on someone vis a vis general education, not impact on how well they can arrange their a schedule. With or without this amendment, anybody could take anything that they would normally take anyhow. Category F impacts on nobody's general education unless students want it to. If they want it to, that is called "an elective." If you want to have an elective, call it an elective. Nobody is impacted by category F, which is silly.

The second silliness is category E, Personal and Social Responsibility. Subjects of that category are not silly, they are very serious. That noncollege was created by the Task Force. They need to have our course to them. They had to create the category so that students could choose A or B. Now, the category suddenly has another course, and the reason for merging these two ones into one is gone. I don't think we should be the category F, we should destroy it.

Morrison: That is not the amendment on the floor, however.

Hagner: But if you do category F, there is less tendency to destroy it. We should give serious consideration to splitting category E. I oppose this proposed amendment because we are trying to refine and fix something that is not worth keeping.

Jeanne Dyer: I am a member of the GER Task Force. If category F is silly, there are a lot of universities doing something very silly. One of the things that was through our general education model is the concept of integrating goals. All of the courses are supposed to address more than one goal, so there is integration within individual courses. Categories have been designed so that there is also integration across related goals and across several courses.

The concept behind category F is that there can be integration of goals that at first might not seem so closely related. Category F is an opportunity for creativity for faculty and some interesting experiences for students. An example of something that might fit in category F, which was recently brought up by the social sciences folks, is designing a course that combines goal 6, social sciences, and goal 11. Category F does not include just any elective; the courses have to be approved.

I would also like to respond to what Dr. Hagner said about Personal and Social Responsibility being a secondary or "lumped together" category. James Madison University has a category with the same title, and it exists at other universities as well, maybe with slightly different titles. This category is about making decisions that affect one's own well-being and the well-being of our society and others. I think it is a very legitimate category and not a bodypoodge of unrelated things. Many psychology, sociology, social work, and health related classes will fall into this category. It is a legitimate field of study.

Tom Shipka: Our person's silliness is sometimes another's solution. It seems to me that this is a helpful amendment in principle. I don't see that any departments will be harmed by it, so I speak in favor of it.

Ruffer: I speak in opposition to this amendment. Thinking about what has gone on today, and thinking that we are behind in our science credits, it seems like this is a place where we can catch up. Students could satisfy this area by taking a natural science or a mathematics course or a course in the Societies and Institutions or Artistic and Literary Perspectives category, and we might increase our average. I divide there is as much concern about universities being lobbied to courses that require social responsibility. I think it is an important area, but there are already 2-3 courses required in it. It seems that by voting down the amendment, we would be able to serve our students better.

Jenkins: The task force worked hard to see that the model would achieve a differentiation appropriate to the distribution that presently exists. Courses will be coming forward from these same departments, and we will probably end up with a similar distribution. We cannot guarantee that this will be the case, but we need to work toward it. As we went from quarters to semesters, we found we had to make some cuts. The reason Personal and Social Responsibility is not in category F is that categories B, C, and D, which had 9 courses, seven in B, and 6 was left that Personal and Social Responsibility, with its 2 courses, did have appropriate representation. To allow Personal and Social Responsibility to category F would increase their share. The task force felt very strongly that sciences, social sciences, and artistic and literary perspectives needed to be there and that the model offers an appropriate representation for Personal and Social Responsibility.

Gore: I am not in favor of the proposed amendment because for people to make use of category F, they need to have some science background. Making good personal and social decisions requires a strong foundation in science: understanding where pollution comes from, what causes it, how to minimize it, how to optimize solutions. Perhaps this is the category where some more science courses can be taken, and through understanding these science courses students will be able to their daily lives to act in a socially and personally responsible manner.

Hunter: Getting back to category F, to the concept that a requirement becomes a requirement only if it impacts on somebody. Students generally fall into four categories. Their major programs are science-based, social science-based, humanities-based, or none of the above. The people who are science-based can take more science under category F. Those who are humanities-based can take more humanities. The people who are "noncollege" can take more interdisciplinary. Students can take more of what they are already taking. This impacts on nobody; it is an exercise in self-direct. All these goals we are talking about don't have to be addressed.

Sears: I was a member of the GER Task Force; from an office perspective. In February and perhaps March 1997, the task force discussed what number of courses seemed to be appropriate under the Natural Science, Societies and Institutions, and Artistic and Literary Perspectives categories. It was the wisdom of the committee at that time that that category determine should be a total of 9 courses. That idea percolated into the summer, along with other deliberations.

Toward the end of the summer, the operation came forward. What about the next category, Personal and Social Responsibility?, which at that time had one course defined. The task force felt more attention should be given to that category, but there were other parameters to be considered concerning the number of total courses. The tradeoff, as I understand it, was that we could add a course to Personal and Social Responsibility, making it 2 courses, but to doing so, we would take away one course from the thermometer, so that instead of the thermometer having a total of 9 courses, it became 8. The understanding was that in accepting that, Personal and Social Responsibility would not be included under category F, which is what this amendment is proposing. I would urge you not to accept this amendment.

Tom Shipka moved the previous question; the motion was seconded.

The previous question carried.

A vote was taken on the amendment. The motion to include Personal and Social Responsibility among the areas listed under category F was defeated.

======

Shipka: I don't believe there are other outstanding motions. I think it is essential that the Senate move ahead to recommendation 2, the implementation strategy. We are approaching the end of the school year. The Senate needs to go on record with a decision concerning recommendation 1, the GER model as amended. I move the previous question (a vote on recommendation 1). The motion was seconded.

(Barbara Brothers raised a point of information: Are we going to be asked to vote on this before we get an update on where we are in regard to the second part, implementation? Some people have expressed concern that we have no idea what the implementation is going to be. Before we vote, I would like for us to know where we stand on recommendation 2, how GER will be implemented.

Morrison: Recommendation 1, the model as amended now, is under consideration. If Dr. Shipka's motion concerning the previous question passes, we will vote on recommendation 1, before discussion of the second part.)

(Sandi Benson Clark asked another point of information: Are we saying we are voting on this entire document as amended without a copy of the amended document before us?

Morrison: Yes. Bennet Clark: I would like to speak in opposition.
Morrison: I'm sorry. Moving the previous question is not debatable. If the motion passes, that will close debate on the main motion: recommendation 1.)

A voice vote and a hand vote were taken, and the motion on the previous question failed for lack of a 2/3 majority.

======

Frank Krygowski: I move that we remove from the table amendment 2 from page 3 of the March 6 Senate minutes (concerning the number of courses in categories B, C, and D in the table on page 3 of the GER Task Force report). The motion was seconded, and a vote was taken. The motion to remove the amendment from the floor was defeated.

======

Rochelle Ruffer: I voted not to close debate because when I was a professor at Ithaca College, they developed a plan very similar to what is proposed here. Though it was a good plan, implementation of the plan was a problem. I was on the review committee in charge of deciding whether courses fit into categories, and our ques to be known as the "jerks." I don't blame people for calling us that. The problem was that we got no guidelines for how to determine whether courses met goals or not. We had to make decisions concerning courses in areas in which we might not have any expertise.

When the Economics Department met with Dr. Jenkins, I thought this up. Specifically, we were talking about the model before goal 11 was included as the major goal in Societies and Institutions. We was talking about major and minor goals and the possibility that a course could meet one goal well and another goal a little bit. But what is "well" and what is "a little bit"? Without knowing how this plan is going to be implemented, I don't feel comfortable voting on this document. I realize that the ASC has not finished its deliberations on implementation, but I think we could have many different GER revisions here, depending on what implementation looks like.

Shipka: My motion to close debate was not an attempt to preempt any amendment on recommendation 1. We have thrashed this model around for about three months. As I understand it, the Senate should go on record as approving or disapproving the model as amended so that we can go on to recommendation 2. Is that not true?

Morrison: The Academic Standards Committee moved the model. It has to be voted up or down. Or it can be amended or postponed. However, right now, what is on the floor is the model.

Shipka: We are getting close to the end of the school year. Can we deal with this motion so that we can move on to implementation and perhaps have the entire model by June? We all have a sense of what has been done. Can we put this model on the floor for a vote and ask the ASC to bring forward its recommendations as soon as it can so that we can discuss and debate implementation? The implementation strategy is nearly as big an issue as everything we have considered so far.

Singler: I pointed out that the GER model essentially had 3 significant parts, which we would consider separately to bring focus to the discussion. The first part, which we have been discussing, is what I would call the framework of the model. The two other parts are part of the original task force report in different ways. One is the implementation, and the other concerns the general education committee that is to follow. It was our intention with the informational report distributed at the beginning of this meeting to tell you where we are and the directions we are going. That report is not final, and we will work very hard to get everything out of our committee before the June meeting. There has been a lot of deliberation about the framework; we are coming forward with the rest of the model as quickly as we can. Our intention was to put everything together as one model as soon as we can.

Brothers: A number of individuals in A&H have expressed concerns related mostly to the same issues that Dr. Ruffer raised. Despite repeated questionings about how the model will be applied, questions arose about the criteria for determining which courses are to be applied, questions arose about the criteria for determining which courses are to be applied, questions arose about the criteria, for instance, we do not get a good understanding. On the one hand, we get told we are to design courses specifically for general ed for an audience that is not our majors. Then we ask, "Will the traditional course in whatever count?" and we get told "yes." There is a real lack of clarity about what the criteria for judging these courses are. To what extent does a course have to address an audience of nonmajors?

We have agreement about the purposes; these passed a long time ago. But I am offering the concerns of a number of chairs and individuals in A&H that the criteria are not clear to the very people who think they would have something to do with designing these courses. The criteria should be clear, and that is what I understand Dr. Ruffer is saying.

Levin: I was also a "jerk"; as our YSU's University Curriculum Committee—and I am the "jerk" chair of this curriculum committee in the College of Education. My answer to the question "How clear is it going to be, how are these debates going to be played out?" is that they will be played out imperfectly. We have models of just how complex and difficult to principle and syllabi in principle are addressed by peer communities. In all of these situations, we have guidelines and principles that come from a variety of sources. Implementation is always an imperfect process based on these guidelines.

I speak in favor of the question. Are we go ahead and adopt the model. We have worked very hard on the model, arrived at a statement of principle, and reached the point that there are no further limeal amendments, so the flow of the Senate. We would certainly vice more concerns, but we have gone through a formal governance process. We have made reasonable amendments. I would force to vote to complete the parliamentary process that we have been wrestling hard on, adopt the model, be confident that we have at least generally what we stand for, and then move on to the implementation process, knowing that there is more to discuss and the model will be imperfect. But I am proud of what we have done so far, and I hope we can vote on it and walk out of here saying, "At least the model is taken care of."

Jenkins: There is a lot of interest, and obviously a lot of worry, about "Will I be able to get my courses meet the goals and have my peers accept those?" That is a legitimate concern. However, if we attempt to stop and say which courses are going to be approved and show everybody exactly how that approval would work, we don't have model 1 to guide us. What is being asked for is total definition without the process of people putting their courses together and being able to see those courses. That is the next stage.

I am assuming that there will be a representative committee, and since the Senate will still have to approve those things, that people will have an opportunity to have their voices heard if things get out of hand. I would also say in response to Dr. Brothers that, on the next page, concerns that get approved move over the goals. They will have to go through a committee to be sure that they do. On the other hand, to say that the basic economics or political science or similar courses within this framework. That does not give a specific answer, but I don't see how I or the task force can answer that question at this point. I do feel that there are options and that committees will be in place for you to be heard and to create what is an exciting curriculum that we can move forward on by fall 2000. We need to get some resolution. We have been told that we need to get our courses in by December 15. We need to have a committee. The Senate could call for reports back on these matters if it wanted to. Those are the options, rather than trying to answer specifics that cannot be answered at this point.

Sears: The Senate is a deliberative body. All though this debate, we have been told we were debating the amendments, not the model. Now, it is time to debate the model as a whole. We need to have more than 5 minutes of debate before we approve the model. But we do not have the whole model, as amended, in writing. We need something in writing so that we can study it and then come and have informed debate, probably at the next meeting. Is there a motion on the floor?

Morrison: Yes. Recommendation 1 of the task force.

Sears: Is it appropriate to make a motion to adjourn until we have a copy of the whole document? I so move.

The motion was seconded. A vote was taken, and the motion to adjourn was defeated.

======

George McCloud: I have learned in 26 years that in order to do general ed, you have to teach one another. It will not work otherwise. Forgive me if I remember Aristotle, but I think he reminded people that one should not expect a form of precision in a certain form of discourse that is inherently impossible in that discourse. We may, if we ask of ourselves a priori levels of specificity on criteria, be doing precisely that and creating a conundrum that is irresolvable.

Now to the particular position that we are in: we have a peculiar parliamentary dilemma. We have something on the floor. We do not have the implementation on the floor. What was moved was the model, part 1. We have to do something with this: act on it, table it, or refer it back to committee, or we are going to sit here in "parliamentary paralysis." There obviously is a sentiment that your ability to act on that which is currently on the floor would be improved if you knew more about that which has not yet been put on the floor.

I would suggest that we take this part of the model, this first part, and refer it back to the ASC with a very specific charge that they bring it forward to the floor after we have discussed and formed the implementation phase and after they have modified both the model and the implementation, to give us something that can be acted on in a unified fashion. Then clears the floor for discussion of the implementation; it puts the ASC in a more deliberated position vis-à-vis reporting it back out to the floor; and I believe if we are persistent, we can respond to the concern that we can allow this to move into the next academic year without some progress. That is what I move that we do.

The motion to refer the model back to the ASC with a specific charge was seconded.

Brown Clark: I wish to speak in support of the motion. It is important for each of us to stand up and refuse to vote on things we are not sure we understand in total. Though we have debated this document and the amendments over a long period of time and I understand that many individuals are tired of discussing it, that does not remove us from the individual responsibility to be sure that we are comfortable with the document. The warnings and fears about time running out fall on deaf ears if they are directed to me. I would rather take the time to peruse the document and be totally comfortable with it than to be rushing blindly down a road with a document that has been amended and discussed repeatedly and we have not seen the total package. I understand that there is something in the April 8 agenda, but I would like to see everything, based on everything we have done, and have an opportunity to peruse it carefully for one or two weeks before we move on it. I speak in support of the motion. Each one of us is individually responsible enough to take that time before we are willing to move forward and vote.

Jenkins: I am ready to vote, but I am sure that others are not. I am speaking not against the motion to refer but against the notion that this can go back to the ASC with the possibility of the ASC's changing it. Motion 1 has been in the hands of the ASC with the possibility of the ASC's changing it. Motion 1 has been in the hands. Motion 1 has been amended through the process of broad representation in the Senate.

[McCloud: Point of information: You are concerned that the ASC might alter the model? That is not my intention. [The secretary could not hear, and the Senate tape is inaudible for a few seconds.]

Jenkins: If you include the words "without tampering with it," I withdraw my objection.)

Brendan Minnegan: How long have we had this document? How long have we been arguing about the parts? For years? The ASC has deliberated, and now we have deliberated for the last 3 or 4 months. It serves no one to take a decision. North Central will be here next week. If I had evaluated this University 30 years ago for North Central and the one criticism I had made was that your GER stinks, and after 30 years you had not responded to that evaluation, "My Irish would get up. My Irish would say, 'you people don't care about North Central.'" It has been a long time to debate. It is time to vote on this thing one way or another. Can I move the previous question?

Morrison: Yes.

Minnegan: I move the previous question so that we can vote on whether to send the model back to the ASC.

The motion was seconded and carried.

(Dennis Hosseman: Point of clarification: Was there a time frame…? [The tape is inaudible.]

Morrison: No.

Singler: Within the ASC, we have already agreed that our target is to have everything possible before the Senate at the June meeting.)

(Brothers: Point of clarification: I want to be sure that Bill Jenkins understands that the concern I have been hearing is not that current courses will not count; it is the opposite: Why are we going through all of this, if indeed. . . .

Morrison: The previous question has been moved; debate has been closed; so the motion to send the model back to committee.)

A voice vote and a hand vote were taken on referring the model back to the committee. The motion to refer to committee passed by a vote of 33 for, 23 opposed.

McCloud: I would suggest that at the moment we are together again, we give the highest priority to thrashing out the concerns on implementation. The moment this body has done so and believes it has something of substance to offer to Academic Standards to verify, we can bring the whole thing back and be prepared to act.

======

ADJOURNMENT: Jim Morrison noted the impending absence of a quorum. The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.