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University Senate Academic Policies Committee
Davies Center Council Oak Room
Volume 49, Number 26
April 16, 2013

Members Present: J. Pratt (Chair), L. Bica, S. Ducksworth-Lawton, D. Dunham, G. Hanson Brenner, S. Fish, J. Hoepner, J. Markgraf, D. Mowry, B. Nowlan, S. Wical, and M. Wick

Guests: M. Cassidy, J. Prushiek, L. Kieffer, M. Goulet, J. Fager, K. Syverson

1. Chair Pratt called the meeting to order at 2:00pm
2. Minutes of the 4-2-13 meeting were approved with revisions. Date added and the text and volume had been switched so they are correct.
3. Minutes of the 4-9-13 meeting with approved with the minor revision of adding the date and correcting a typo.
4. Geology Program Review
   Chair Pratt commended the Geology Department Chair Kent Syverson for his department and noted that this was the first program review that addressed recommendations from a previous program review. The department is providing more seats in Geology 106 and the issue of salary compression was discussed. Graduates from a four year Geology program are starting at salaries in the 60,000-65,000 range. A sand company recently hired a student graduate at $80,000 and K. Syverson commented that there are many opportunities for graduates.

J. Markgraf asked if there were local options for the field study. K. Syverson responded that the geological formations are simple in New Mexico and more appropriate for Geology I, whereas Geology II deals with more complicated structures. This seems to be working well. With a six week program students get sick at the end of the course and it often prevents students for working if six weeks of their summer is taken up with a field study course.

Chair Pratt asked about the students feeling as though they are on call for 24/7 and Syverson mentioned the time spent outside of the classroom. With field trips, students return and are under the gun for their other classes. K. Syverson likened the challenges faced by Geology students to be similar to those faced by student athletes. Additionally, there are numerous things that can go wrong with field trips—sickness, injuries, windshields breaking, bad weather. Also, Geologists tend to love what they do and can really push themselves.

Chair Pratt noted that reputable institutions are sending their students to UWEC for the Geology field trips. She asked if we are limiting our opportunities. K. Syverson could not recall the last time that they had non-UWEC students at Field Camp II.
Internal Reviewers recommend a change in form or direction.

K. Syverson mentioned that students are being called into consulting positions and that they will eventually be called into regulatory positions. Geology has seen a 4-5 fold increase in students and this can be attributed in part to Environmental Sustainability initiatives and the Watershed Institute. K. Syverson noted that there are more freshmen declared majors. K. Syverson also commented that he does not want to move away from the service opportunities that Geology provides for lower division liberal education. Also, hydrogeology has a great reputation.

The challenge is having instructional academic staff to fill in for sabbaticals and leaves of absence. While it provides an excellent experience for some of them, it is at the expense of the students.

Chair Pratt asked if all of the five emphases are still needed or if resources could be reallocated to support a Sustainable Mining program. K. Syverson indicated that cutting one emphasis would not change the financial demand on the department. These emphases have the same core and some of the different requirements are courses outside of the department, like biology courses or mathematics courses. K. Syverson said that to continue to operate the way that they have been operating in the past is not sustainable. The program is already in a state of change.

D. Mowry mentioned that if the legislature would like to place a program, this would be a good spot. K. Syverson talked about responsible mining and that what is meant is mining done in a way to minimize impact. With what was formerly called DIN funding, now known as something like Talent and Economic Development, decreasing, Geology may need to follow the College of Business model in securing external funding. K. Syverson said that he doesn't see the state funding coming back to the level of where it had been.

K. Syverson indicated that there is a need for a Contaminant Hydrogeologist to teach fluid-rock interactions. Reclamation is another place where there is a needed expertise in the form of a faculty member. There is a need for someone to teach Ecological Restoration. There are great research opportunities.

S. Duckworth-Lawton asked about the recommendations that were bulleted in the program review, including putting the ADA at 100%.

K. Syverson indicated that it would be wise to add a hydrogeologist. Also, more money is needed for field study. With the special course fees the courses can be very expensive and courses should not just be enjoyed by rich students.

K. Syverson indicated that the travel cuts to the geology department were not budget neutral. Money is needed to provide high-impact practices.
Chair Pratt explained the process the APC is taking for program reviews and indicated the timeline to K. Syverson.

5. Chemistry Review form and narrative review

APC concurred with the Chemistry Chair’s opinions on Recommendation 3 and Recommendation 4

The APC voted that the Chemistry Department Continue in present form and this passed unanimously (9-0).

6. The Chair of the Economics Department accepted the change APC made to the Economics Program Review form.

The APC unanimously voted yes (9-0) that the Economics Department continue in present form.

7. Liberal education and credit bearing discussion

J. Markgraf asked about the cost impact on students of making learning experiences credit-bearing.

S. Ducksworth-Lawton indicated that there are vehicles for non-faculty to teach an experience. Departments are authorized to determine that someone who does not have a tenure track position is able to teach a course.

M. Wick indicated that the provost wants a definition that would allow the determination of resource requirements. M. Goulet commented that removing restrictions of faculty led and course credit would only increase resources available.

There are increased resource demands on those who are not faculty.

L. Bica asked if students are doing this stuff anyway, why aren’t they getting credit?

With the public release of credit hours it is important to note that not everything that faculty do is documented—even by outside reviewers. If people are only looking at activities that are attached to credit hours, then the full picture is not conveyed.

A lot of what faculty and staff do for students is not counted or “come out of hide.” Independent studies are then discouraged.

There is also the potential to spread the opportunity around and share the workload if not restricted to faculty.
D. Mowry provided some statistics on service learning. Faculty do spend time supervising students within student learning. He mentioned the Civic Engagement Rubric figure and suggested that people did not understand figures. Claimed that the mapping exercise did not carefully count the non-credit options.

M. Goulet indicated that the mapping exercise fell a little short. We were instructed to read carefully outcome R3. There are serious concerns. The use of the two instances of “and” is problematic because of it being interpreted that someone must meet all of the outcomes and not just one. The mapping exercise under-counted.

L. Bica asked why must it be folded in? Chair Pratt asked Don if he’d be comfortable with S-L continuing as a university requirement without being aligned with an outcome. Some S-L projects—especially those not associated with credits—would count toward S-L but not towards an outcome. Until we make changes to service learning, it might be better to keep it as a university requirement but not align it with a particular outcome. D. Mowry indicated that it be left in.

Chair Pratt cautioned that we look at Plan B and Plan C. She wants to make sure liberal education reform gets passed. She encourages the APC to look and have a good feel for what aspirationally we can do, but also what is feasible. There is a need to get this passed so that it is ready for the next catalog. Nothing is grandfathered in; please look at each of the amendments that come up at the workshops.

The APC was adjourned at 3:08 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie H. Wical
Secretary for the meeting