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Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of February 22, 1988
AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE
THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Meeting Notice: February 22, 1988, 126 Clinton Hall, 3:30 PM.

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Proposals and Statements

III. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of February 8, 1988 (Vol. XXIV, No. 8).

IV. New Business:

1. Proposed amendment to the Constitution--Attachment A. (The Executive Committee recommends that this item be discussed today but no action is to be taken. The item will be brought up for action at the next Senate meeting.)

2. Recommendation from the Honors Committee concerning the Honors core--Attachment B. (The Executive Committee recommends that this item be discussed today but no action is to be taken. The item will be brought up for action at the next Senate meeting.)

3. Recommendation from the Academic Affairs Committee--Attachment C.

V. Adjournment

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Rogers, Senate President</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpha Duell, Senate Vice President</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Nelson, Senate Secretary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Zoller, Senate President-elect</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Greenberg, Elected by Senate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Childs, Elected by Senate</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer Hoyer, Appointed by Senate President</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE CONSTITUTION

Election of the Senate President by Faculty Voting

I. Constitutional Amendment:

1. Change Article II, Section 1 to read as follows:

The University Faculty shall elect the President of the Faculty Senate from among themselves for a term of two years. The Senate shall elect its vice president and secretary from among its membership for terms of one year. Terms of office begin June 1.

a. Any member of the Senate electorate as specified in Article I, Section 1 may be elected President of the Senate, except that no person can be elected to consecutive terms. A person may succeed to the presidency in midterm and then be elected to a full term in his/her own right, and a person may serve multiple non-consecutive terms.

b. Nomination for the office of Senate President requires the filing of two documents with the Senate Secretary before March 1 of odd-numbered years. The first document is a statement of candidacy and a pledge to serve the full term if elected; this must be signed by the candidate. The second document is a petition of support signed by no fewer than twenty-five (25) members of the electorate from any three (3) of the areas specified in Article I from which senators are elected.

c. Election will be by secret ballot of the electorate. Voting shall commence at 8:30 am on the first Monday in April of odd-numbered years and shall continue through 5:00 pm of the following Friday. The Senate Rules Committee shall conduct and oversee the election and tally the results after the end of voting. No intermediate counts shall be taken. Each candidate shall be permitted an observer of the tally. The candidate receiving a majority of the valid, unspoiled ballots shall be declared elected. Appeals against balloting procedures and vote tallies will first be heard by the Senate Rules Committee, and appeals from its decisions will be heard by the Faculty Senate, whose decision is final. Tie votes will be resolved by toss of a coin.

d. In the event no candidate receives a majority of the votes, a run-off election will be held from the third Monday of April through the following Friday. Those two candidates who receive more votes than all the others in the first election will compete in this run-off; otherwise, the same procedures used in the first election apply.
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e. The Faculty Senate President may be removed from office for malfeasance, misfeasance, or nonfeasance of office or professional duties. Such charges should be brought to the Senate Rules Committee. If, after review, that committee deems the charges warranted, it shall refer the matter to the Faculty Senate, which shall hear the allegations in a special session, to be presided over by the Chairperson of the Rules Committee. The accused shall be accorded representation of his/her choice and an opportunity to present a defense in both committee and Senate proceedings. Upon completion of presentation of evidence the Senate shall vote by secret ballot upon the question of whether that evidence warrants removal of the Senate President from office. If two-thirds (2/3) of the members present (the President and Vice President shall have no vote and shall not be considered to be present for purposes of making the count) vote "Yes," the office shall be immediately vacated.

f. If the office of the Senate President shall become vacant in mid term for any reason, the Vice President of the Senate shall assume the office of President for the remainder of that presidential term.

g. The President shall serve as a fifth senator-at-large. Should the President-elect be a member of the Senate at the time of her/his election, that seat shall be declared vacant upon assuming the office of President. The vacated seat shall be filled in accord with provisions in the Senate Constitution and By-Laws. The President's removal from office also means removal from the Senate and the new President automatically assumes that Senate seat. The resultant vacancy in the former president's seat shall be filled according to established procedures.

2. Rules Change:

RULES COMMITTEE:

a. Composition: 7 members

5 chosen from among 8 faculty divisions and Academic Services.

Vice President of the Senate (Chair; during Presidential impeachment proceedings the Vice President will designate a Rules Committee member to serve as Chair).

1 Student
(No further changes)
The Honors Committee moves:

Insert in the University Catalog, page 14, between paragraphs 3 and 4 under "Emory Lindquist Honors Program" the following:

"Beginning August 1, 1989, honors students will be required to complete the following core:

6 Hours of History
   HIST 101G: History of Western Civilization (to 1648) (3), and
   HIST 102G: History of Western Civilization (from 1648) (3);

3 Hours of Literature
   ENGL 220G: The Literary Heritage: English Masterpieces (3), or
   ENGL 272Q: Origins of the Western Literary Tradition (3);

3 Hours of Fine Arts
   ART F 110Q: Foundation Visual Arts (3), or
   ART H. 124: Survey of Western Art: Modern (3), or
   MUS C. 160G: Heritage of Western Music (3);

3 Hours of Philosophy
   PHIL 100G: The Meaning of Philosophy (3);

4-5 Hours Natural Sciences with Laboratory
   GEOG 111Q General Geology (4), or
   PHYS 213Q General College Physics I (5), or
   PHYS 313Q University Physics I (4) and
     " 315Q University Physics Lab I (1), or
   CHEM 111Q General Chemistry (5), or
   BIOL 105G Human Organism (4), or
   BIOL 120Q Introduction to Microbiology (4), or
   ANTH 101Q Biological Anthropology (3) and
     " 106 Biological Anthropology Laboratory (1);

3 Hours of Social Science
   PSY 111Q General Psychology (3), or
   SOC 111Q: Introduction to Sociology (3), or
   ANTH 124Q: General Anthropology (3);

5 Hours of Mathematics
   MATH 242Q Calculus I (5);

3 Hours of American Government
   POL S. 121Q: American Politics (3)."
Rationale:

The aim of the core curriculum is to assure that honors students have a firm general understanding of our intellectual heritage in the humanities, arts, and sciences. It supplements General Education requirements by assuring that honors students receive the benefits of a broad liberal education commensurate with their superior ability and motivation. Our hope is to promote and enrich appreciation of our intellectual heritage not only for its own sake but also to provide students with the best possible framework for future learning and living. We emphasize lower-division courses as this is most commensurate with the aim of assuring a basic background, which it is hoped will provide guidance in the choice of upper-division electives as well as skills and knowledge useful in the study of more specialized and advanced areas of study. The core has been made mandatory so as to assure common experience and a common minimum level of challenge and achievement, and to counter tendencies to sacrifice general learning for the sake of specific career preparation. Of most importance is that it provide a focused and integrated learning experience. We expect that courses will be taught with an eye not only to specific content, but also to improving students' critical and expository abilities.

Core items have been chosen from regularly offered courses that best fit these objectives, and will comprise both honors and non-honors sections. The committee intends to work on improvement of fit between content and objectives, by encouraging both the modification of these courses and the development of new courses. This core is seen as a first step in the development of later programs comprised of courses designed primarily for honors students. The restriction to 30-31 hours in limited offerings is designed to meet pedagogical aims while accommodating other important concerns, among them: (1) preventing conflict of core requirements with other university and college requirements, (2) permitting adequate leeway in the choice of honors electives, and (3) avoiding dilution of our educational objectives. In addition, restriction of offerings within each area will better enable efficient management and improvement of the core curriculum.

The Honors Director will have broad discretionary powers in the granting of exceptions. Among other things, exceptions decisions will take account of the fact that core offerings may not be suitable for students majoring in certain areas specified in the core. The Senate Honors Committee will be informed of all exceptions and will function in an advisory and oversight capacity with respect to the exceptions process.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate Honors Committee:
Linda Bakken
William Bischoff
Randall Haydon
Lanny Milbrandt
Catherine Perel
William Terrell
Robert Feleppa, Chair
February 15, 1988

To: Faculty Senate

From: Nancy McCarthy Snyder, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee

Subject: Proposed Honors Core Curriculum

The Academic Affairs Committee was asked to review the proposed core curriculum for honors students. We have chosen to respond with a general observation rather than with specific recommendations.

The Academic Affairs Committee is generally supportive of the concept of an honors core and of the appropriateness of a relatively tight focus for that core. We are disappointed, however, that the proposed core limits itself to western knowledge, history, and culture. We believe that students being educated today will interact regularly with individuals from non-western cultures. If our graduates are to be effective leaders and good citizens, they need to be knowledgeable about the lives and experiences of those with whom they will be working and relating.

This is a concern that goes beyond the honors core but one that should not be ignored.
11 February 1988

TO: Honors Committee
    Faculty Senate

FROM: Committee on General Education

SUBJECT: Proposed Honors Core Curriculum

The Committee on General Education has been asked to comment and offer its advice on the draft honors core curriculum developed by the Senate Honors Committee. After reviewing the proposal, and discussing it with the Chair of the Honors Committee, we offer the following observations and recommendations.

The proposed core outlines the means by which honors students would, in the future, satisfy existing general education requirements. Its adoption would put the honors program in a position parallel to several colleges, which have established more prescriptive requirements in general education for their students within the framework of existing university distribution requirements. In this respect, the proposed core fits the letter, although not perhaps the spirit, of the existing general education program. It departs from the spirit in that it is based on the principle of requiring a detailed curriculum, rather than permitting individual students a wide latitude of choice in course selections. Our recent faculty survey found that members of the faculty generally support a more prescriptive approach, and the Committee concurs in principle.

Granting this, the Committee also notes that the proposal raises several questions, which have not yet been answered to our satisfaction. They prompt several recommendations, outlined below.

First, the proposed core incorporates only existing courses. We are acquainted with the programmatic reasons that prompted the Honors Committee to this result, but it is our belief that further consideration is merited. Are these existing courses, in both their design and in their methods of instruction, appropriate courses for an honors core?

Second, it is evident that this core would become a significant part of the undergraduate experience for each honors student. Are the courses and emphases selected suitable for this role? Specifically, is the core as proposed an attractive and challenging curriculum, such as a prospective honors student would expect from the university? The proposal has a very distinctive focus, supported by a deliberate curricular theory, yet it contains no special or unique courses or seminars in which that conception and its rationale could be conveyed to students enrolled in it. Is it sufficient that only the selection of courses, but not their design, instructional method, or the students admitted to them be specified in an honors curriculum? To put this in another way: in what sense does passage through this core constitute an honors experience? In view of these concerns, we make the following recommendation:
In addition to courses in specific areas, honors students will be required to enroll in a Freshman Seminar. While seminar design would be a matter for the Honors Committee to determine in detail, these courses should be intensive and challenging intellectual experiences, and should incorporate an integrating conception of the honors curriculum as part of their content. (These seminars might properly count towards the existing requirement that honors students take at least 15 hours in designated honors courses, and would not, in that case, increase the total hours required.)

Third, the proposal offers a fairly concentrated introduction to western civilization as its main feature. Is this an appropriate direction to take? We support the idea of offering some focus or concentration; to do so makes it much more likely that students will enjoy a richer, more challenging experience than a disjoint collection of courses can offer. However, this does not in itself address the concerns of those who have persuasively argued for a more international or global curriculum. We appreciate that the Honors Committee does not regard these as exclusive possibilities, and we agree. However, it is not clear to us that the proposal allows adequately for additional studies directed to other cultural traditions. The difficulty is that the proposed core would occupy nearly all the general education hours available for the typical student. In view of this concern, we make the following minimum recommendation:

Substitute in the proposed core curriculum History 100G: World History From 1500 for History 102G: Western Civilization 1648-Present.

We do not think that it is inconsistent with a focus on western civilization to view especially its most recent centuries in a world context.

Finally, we generally support the strong humanities emphasis of the proposed core. It corrects a neglect that has been the object of both national discussion and local concern. At the same time, we must note that the means selected for addressing this need are very traditional, even old-fashioned. We would not urge their rejection for this reason, but we wonder whether the committee considered any more innovative, imaginative, or bold solutions before settling on what they have offered us. There are a wide range of honors curricula available nation-wide from which inspiration might be drawn, and any number of interesting ways to reinvigorate humanities education, and integrate it with other studies. Our own university sponsored a team of faculty members at an NEH program last summer that considered some of these options. Were their ideas solicited in the development of this proposal? These concerns prompt a final recommendation which only modestly reflects them. It is our understanding that the Honors Committee was not altogether satisfied with the choice of literature courses available to them. In view of that, we recommend:

The Honors Committee should approach the English Department to determine if a more suitable course meeting the needs of the core could be identified, or even created, if necessary.
1. The Academic Affairs Committee moves adoption of the attached Course Deactivation Policy.

Rationale: There is an ongoing need to maintain currency and vitality in our curriculum. The attached policy will serve two functions -- to promote consumer protection of students and to provide an impetus for departments to maintain regular and systematic review and updating of curricula.

2. Academic Affairs moves adoption of the attached course approval form:

Rationale: Although some concern has been raised about course duplication, the Academic Affairs Committee believes that the current policy for new course approval is basically sound. The Committee does recommend, however, that the college curriculum committees be encouraged to enforce sections V. "Relation to Curricula in Other Departments" and VI. "Additional Resources and Personnel Required" of the existing curriculum change form. If the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs decides that a new course proposal involves intercollegiate duplication or conflict, he or she will refer the case to the Academic Affairs Committee.

The committee also recommends that an appeal process be added to the current procedures. If a new course proposal is rejected by the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, the initiating department may appeal to the Senate Academic Affairs Committee for review.

Finally, the committee recommends that the current WSU Curriculum Change Form be amended to include a section specifying the date at which the change will become effective.

3. Academic Affairs moves adoption of the following policy with respect to various honors designation for students:

That all honors granted by The Wichita State University be based on WSU grade point. It is further recommended that the Honors Convocation adopt the same standard as graduation honors and that class honors be granted to part-time students who have completed 12 hours for freshmen, 30 hours for sophomores, 60 hours for juniors and 90 hours for seniors of graded courses from The Wichita State University with a cumulative WSU g.p.a. of 3.75.

Rationale: It is the opinion of the Academic Affairs Committee that honors awarded by WSU should be based on academic work performed at WSU. The above proposal provides that students enrolled part-time could qualify for class honors, instead of the current policy which requires that a student be enrolled for 12 hours of graded courses to qualify for recognition under honors. The point has been made that as an urban institution, WSU should include in its class honors group those students who are enrolled part-time in the recognition semester.
The recommended policy would require the following changes in the catalog:

Academic Recognition (p. 15 current catalog)

Paragraph 1. Add sentence: "All honors are based on WSU grade-point average."

Paragraph 4. Add: "Each spring outstanding students are recognized at the University Honors Convocation. Invitations are extended to graduating Seniors with cumulative WSU grade point averages of 3.25 or higher. Class honors are awarded to other students who have completed a minimum of 12 hours of graded course work at WSU with a cumulative WSU grade point average of 3.75 or higher."

4. Academic Affairs move adaption of the following policy and accompanying catalog change:

The A/Pass/Fail grading option may not be used for General Education courses, i.e. courses with a "G" or "Q" suffix.

Rationale: That A/Pass/Fail grading is inappropriate if one of the major functions of the General Education program is to provide a common core of knowledge and skills. The current option allows students to avoid mastery of some of the subject matter presented in "G" and "Q" courses and is counter to the intent of General Education. The General Education Committee agrees with this recommendation and rationale.

Catalog change:

(p. 17 current catalog) I. Basic skills. Add sentence: "The A/Pass/Fail grading option may not be used for basic skill courses."

II. Distribution. Part A. Add sentence: "The A/Pass/Fail grading option is not available for "G" and "Q" courses taken to meet the general education distribution requirements."

(p. 11) A/Pass/Fail Option. First paragraph would read: Students in good standing with at least 12 hours of completed course credit and an overall grade point average of at least 2.500 as verified by a transcript of their college work may elect to enroll under the A/Pass/Fail (A/P/F) option in a total of three regularly graded courses outside their general education requirements and their major or supporting minor area.
I. INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE: This policy is established to insure students have accurate catalog information about the opportunities to study at The Wichita State University. The policy establishes procedures for identifying courses to be stricken from the catalog (called deactivation), procedures for offering courses in the deactivated category, procedures for activating courses deactivated and having such courses included in the catalog (called reactivation), and procedures for identifying courses among those courses deactivated for possible deletion.

II. POLICY STATEMENT

A. IDENTIFYING COURSES TO BE DEACTIVATED

1. Courses not offered within the most recent five year period are candidates for deactivation.

2. Each Spring the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will request the registrar to compile a list of courses not offered during the most recent five year period. This is the list of courses which are "Candidates for Deactivation."

3. The list of "candidate courses" will be distributed to deans, along with a request to share this information with relevant chairpersons, for review and consideration.

4. Unless the Chairperson and Dean request a course or set of courses be retained or deleted through the regular curriculum committee procedures, the "candidate courses" provided by the registrar will be deactivated. Deactivation means they will not be advertised in the catalog. Deactivated courses may be offered (see below), reinstated (see below), and "blue-carded."

5. A list of deactivated courses, including course descriptions, will be distributed to relevant deans for distribution to appropriate curriculum committees and chairpersons.

B. PROCEDURES FOR OFFERING A DEACTIVATED COURSE -- courses which have been deactivated may be included in a schedule of courses by following the procedures outlined below.

1. The Chairperson should list the deactivated course(s) on the proposed course schedule as he/she would a regular course.

2. The chairperson should submit THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM CHANGE FORM through the Dean, to the Registrar requesting that the deactivated course(s) be offered with the proposed course schedule. You only need to complete item #9 at the top of this form and item 1A,1-3, indicating "OFFERING DEACTIVATED COURSE." Attach this to the proposed course schedule. The Schedule of Courses will
include a course description for any deactivated course that is offered.

3. Submit a copy of the CURRICULUM CHANGE FORM to the office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. This is for information purposes, only.

C. PROCEDURES FOR INCLUDING A DEACTIVATED COURSE IN THE NEXT CATALOG PRINTING -- The procedures for having a deactivated course made active and advertised in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs (i.e., reactivation) are also relatively straightforward. However, reactivation only should be undertaken when a department expects to regularly offer a course that is currently deactivated:

1. The chairperson should submit a THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM CHANGE FORM through the dean, to the office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. Complete item #9, indicating other action, INCLUSION IN CATALOG," and Section I.A, showing the department and course number, course title, credit hours, course description, prerequisites, and the appropriate 11-digit identification number. Under Section VI briefly outline the manner in which the department will regularly offer the course(s).

2. If the course is being offered immediately, also attach a copy of the CURRICULUM CHANGE FORM to the proposed schedule.

3. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will forward the request both to University Communications (for inclusion in the relevant catalogs) and to the Registrar's Office (to take the course(s) out of the deactivated file).

D. DELETION OF DEACTIVATED COURSES -- A deactivated course may be deleted if it is not periodically offered:

1. Each Spring the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will request from the registrar a list of courses that have been on deactivated status for 5 years.

2. Unless requested otherwise by both the chairperson and dean, courses on this list will be deleted through the regular curriculum committee procedure.

E. INFORMATION ABOUT DEACTIVATED COURSES -- A list of deactivated courses will be made available to students and faculty.

1. The Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will request the registrar to provide a list of deactivated courses each Fall semester. This list will be distributed to relevant deans, for distribution to relevant chairpersons, departments and curriculum committees.

2. Whenever a deactivated course is offered, a course description will be included in that semester's Schedule of Courses.
CURRICULUM CHANGE FORM, p.3
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COURSE NUMBER

---

A. College (0-499)

____ Approved ____ Disapproved Date ______

Department Chairperson or Program Coordinator

____ Approved ____ Disapproved Date ______

College Curriculum Committee

____ Approved ____ Disapproved Date ______

College Dean

B. Graduate School (500 and above)

____ Approved ____ Disapproved Date ______

Graduate Council

____ Approved ____ Disapproved Date ______

Graduate Dean

C. University (if applicable-overlap, new program, etc.)

____ Approved ____ Disapproved Date ______

University Curriculum Committee

Academic Affairs

____ Approved ____ Disapproved Date ______

University Senate

Faculty

D. Administration

____ Approved ____ Disapproved* Date ______

Academic Vice President

Recorded in the Curriculum Journal

Date

Effective Date

Admissions and Records

* E. If disapproved by the Academic Vice President the requesting department may appeal to the Academic Affairs Committee of the University Senate.

____ Approved ____ Disapproved Date ______

Academic Affairs Committee
SUMMARY OF SENATE ACTION:

Motion: The Academic Affairs Committee moves adoption of the proposed Course Deactivation Policy. Motion passed.


Guests: V. Pangburn, J. Sheffield, Linda Starnes, Leo Traverzo, Kelly Shand, Kathy Bradshaw.

President Rogers called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

The minutes of February 8 were approved as circulated.

President Rogers explained that the two items listed under New Business, the Proposed amendment to the Constitution (see Attachment A, Feb. 8 Agenda) and Recommendation from the Honors Committee concerning the Honors core (see Attachment B, Feb. 8 Agenda) were scheduled for discussion but would not be voted on at this meeting. Both issues will be brought forward at the March 7 meeting, which will allow time for consideration and consultation.

Dr. James Sheffield presented the amendment to the Constitution, which states that "The University Faculty shall elect the President of the Faculty Senate from among themselves for a term of two years." He explained that this amendment was seen as a part of the general reform of faculty governance procedures, had been detailed so that it was ready to be incorporated into the present system, and was intended to give the faculty a more forceful voice. He described the amendment as having two primary elements:

1. Currently, there is no university-wide forum for discussion of issues except the Senate. A campus-wide election would serve to provide such a forum because candidates would need to cover the entire campus and debate issues in order to be elected. In addition, and as a result of this kind of election, the president would speak for the University faculty as a whole rather than the Senate.
2. The two-year term would grant a president additional time to put to use the expertise acquired in the office.

Several issues for further discussion were raised, including whether the president should have University Faculty Senate experience and whether the election date might need adjustment to allow for necessary schedule changes for the candidate.

Dr. Robert Feleppa presented the Recommendation from the Honors Committee concerning the Honors core. He explained that the recommendation was seen as a first step toward providing a more focused program in this area.
He stated that the core was intended to provide a frame of reference that would correct the fragmentation which currently exists. Dr. Feleppa defended the focus on Western culture on the grounds that (a) it reflected the students' own heritage, (b) it had intrinsic value and diversity, and (c) it was the best way to give students a coherent grasp of their world. Such a core would be seen not as a limitation but a necessary condition for widening the students' experience.

He said the specific courses had been chosen because they represented an overview, yet offered depth, and could be easily implemented. What was desired, he explained, was a combination of courses that had pedagogical value and at the same time would define a common experience for honors students—something that could provide a basis for discussion and for identification with the program. He also noted that the exceptions procedure would enable students to substitute or change requirements if this were necessary.

Concerns were expressed in the following areas:
1. Because of the number of hours and the rigidity, would such a core automatically prevent students in certain areas from joining the program?
2. Is it appropriate for an "Honors Core" to be made up of courses that may—or may not—be designed as honors courses? Why not a core of specifically designed courses?
3. What is the difference between—or relationship of—the core and those courses being discussed for the revised general education curriculum?
4. Can the emphasis on Western Civilization be justified; further, is the emphasis "European" rather than "Western"?
5. Can the emphasis on courses that often exclude women be justified, especially since two-thirds of the students involved are female?
6. Is there a problem with designing a core before an Honors Director is selected?

President Rogers reiterated that action on the above issues would be taken at the March 7 meeting.

Dr. Nancy Snyder, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee, moved adoption of the Course Deactivation Policy (see Agenda Attachment C). Dr. Snyder explained that the policy was to formalize procedures for dealing with courses that were to be removed from the catalogue; in general, these are courses that have not been offered for five years.

Senator Brown noted that 65% to 70% of the courses falling in this category in Liberal Arts were graduate level courses and indicated this might present recruitment problems for graduate programs.

As a result of a discussion on this subject, Senator Greenberg moved, and Senator Kitch seconded, that the motion be amended to read "Undergraduate courses, numbered 699 or below, not offered within the most recent five year period are candidates for deactivation." Motion failed.

In response to a question from Senator Snyder, Dr. Snyder pointed out that deactivated courses could be restored without going through the Curriculum Committee.
Vice President Scott stated that while the issue hadn't been legally tested, the catalogue often was seen as a contract and should not misrepresent what the University actually offered.

Senator Graham noted that the policy was a reasonable compromise and the motion was passed.

The meeting was adjourned.

Susan Nelson, Senate Secretary
Lucille Brodie, Recording Secretary