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University Senate Academic Policies Committee
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January 28, 2014


Guests: Margaret Cassidy, Jennifer Fager, Deb Jansen, Jill Prushiek, Gail Scukanec, Tim Vaughan

1.0 Approval of the 12/10/2013 Meeting Minutes
- Minutes were approved as distributed.

2.0 Progress of Liberal Education Reform
- J. Pratt opened the discussion by asking if the use of “and” in the outcome language for Skills 1 (read, write, speak, and listen) and Responsibility 3 (civic, social, and environmental responsibility) was too restrictive.
- J. Fager indicated that when developing the outcomes, the Chairs group discussed three options— and, or, and/or. “And” was adopted with the understanding that language may need to change because the available offerings to address these outcomes were unknown.
- G. Scukanec said there is a general understanding that one experience does not have to meet all aspects of the outcome (“or” is implied)
- T. Vaughan suggested the curriculum be designed such that student would experience all four components of the Skills 1 outcome; no one course would be expected to address all four components.
- M Cassidy stated that Arts & Sciences has not yet received many proposals for Responsibility 3 and Skills 1. Those that have come through are emphasizing a subset of the components, not all components.
- J. Fager suggested that Skills 1 is different than Responsibility 3 because it aligns more closely with the two AAC&U rubrics, oral communication and written communication—which have been combined into the outcome for our campus.
- J. Pratt questioned again if the rubrics were broad enough to be useful.
- J. Fager asserted that the current rubrics will work with “and” or “or.”
- M. Carney agreed that the intent of these outcomes was to have students experience all of the components over the course of their entire liberal education experience; no one course is expected to address all components of the outcome.
- N. Gannon indicated that Skills 1 is probably a moot point for Art students, as most are required to take a language course. Gannon questioned if 1 writing course and 2 language courses will result in students experiencing all four components.
- J. Markgraf asked if the outcome language could result in students only having a subset of the components at graduation.
- G. Scukanec stated that the outcomes were not created such that one course has to do everything; measurement will occur in the elements.
- J. Fager said, when the outcomes were approved, the University Senate agreed to conduct a review in 5 years. We need to collect data on the outcomes, then, in 5 years, determine if an outcome is or is not working.
- T. Vaughn said he understood the intent of Chairs and their intent was good; however, he now realizes that intent could be satisfied better if these outcomes were written in a different way. There are potential problems whether we use “and” and “or.” We may need to separate Skills 1 into two goals, one focusing on writing and one on speaking.
- J. Pratt indicated a need to give these goals a chance at implementation before doing a major revision.
- S. Fish suggested that students will not know if an outcome is intended to be fully addressed in one class or their entire academic experience.
- J. Pratt asked what guidance is available in the application instructions.
- M. Cassidy indicated that the issue of meeting a subset vs. all components of an outcome is not mentioned on the application form; however, ULEC has now started notifying instructors that they should explicitly reference rubric elements in their applications.
- N. Gannon asked if confusion about what classes exactly need to address could be the cause of deficits for certain LE goals.
- J. Pratt asked if an experience needs to meet all elements of a rubric, and if an artifact needs to meet all elements.
- J. Fager responded that an experience does need to meet all elements, but a single artifact does not.
- N. Gannon noted that the Integrative Learning goal was one of the more challenging areas in terms of resources and indicated that he would like to see more options for this goal.
- J. Pratt reviewed the Liberal Education Reform implementation timeline. She stated that, as the Senate committee most closely related to LE reform, the APC should be expected to take the lead on making revisions/improvements before the Senate has a volatile reaction.
- S. Ducksworth-Lawton asked if Skills 1 and Responsibility 3 are the only major problems or if there are other problems.
- M. Carney indicated that there are also not enough resources for Integrative Learning and Skills 3. Carney did not think N. Gannon’s concern was an issue—confusion over outcome language is not limiting the number of course proposals. Carney hopes our campus will be careful with resources so as not to dismantle the University Senate LE proposal.
- L. Bica asked for an update on ULEC activities.
- J. Pratt indicated that ULEC is wrestling with all of the issues the APC wrestled with last year and that it has been a good process.
- M. Carney stated that 80 faculty offered to pilot classes across all 11 outcomes.
- M. Cassidy indicated that fall semester’s focus was on catalogue copy. Her office is now focused on LE applications. Applications contain very good information; any revisions typically involve only tweaking in order to help assignments better match the rubrics.
- J. Pratt said although this is a very laborious process, things are moving along on schedule.
- N. Gannon asked if upper-division courses in LE will continue to be required.
- M. Cassidy reminded the group that this is an A&S requirement only. The College will debate the issue during meetings this semester.

3.0 Upcoming Agenda Items

- J. Pratt announced that the next scheduled APC meeting will be cancelled and encouraged members to attend the presentation by M. Carney, candidate for Associate Vice Chancellor for Curriculum, Internationalization, and Immersion. Pratt emphasized the importance of this position as the APC’s link to the Provost, especially with respect to items approved by University Senate that could potentially be stopped by upper administration.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Lori Bica, secretary for the meeting