AC - 4/29/2014

AC called to order at 2:01 PM

Present: N Gannon, D Mowry, L Bica, J Markgraf, S Duckworth-Lawton, S Wical, G Hanson Brenner; D Dunham, J Hoepner, M Carney, J Pratt

Guests: Margaret Cassidy, Jill Prushiek, Debra Jansen, Karl Markgraf

4/22 meeting minutes were approved as distributed

Approval of faculty led immersion experiences - Shanti Freitas - intercultural immersion programs on campus - coordinating the FLEA - faculty led international program?

Waving/satisfying 2/3 foreign language/foreign culture requirements through the 4-6 week FLEA program.

Credits are linked to the experience, as a way to capture that experience.

The course has the immersion experience built in.

The scoring rubric dictates how many points needed for various credit levels (i.e., 1/3 or 2/3 of the FL/FC requirement).

S. Ducksworth-Lawton - is there a way to modify the rubric so that it captures the foreign culture aspects?

K. Markgraf - rubric does reflect multiple elements of cultural immersion and is flexible in achieving those outcomes.

S. Ducksworth-Lawton - how do we capture English speaking immersion experiences?

Freitas - anything that is approved for FLIEE would automatically qualify.

J. Pratt - it seems like it would be better to modify the rubric than just accept anything that is BCDT funded and approved by FLIEE. This is important because we want to assure the rigor of all immersion programs.

Discussion ensued about the rigor of the program and how to evaluate this among a range of different immersion sites/experiences.

M. Carney - the FLIEE proposal process guarantees that faculty have met the requirements for rigor of the experience to meet criteria for a FC immersion program. Discussed pre-departure programming, post-return debriefing, etc. which makes the standard. There is no rubric for FLIEE - it is determined by committee vote, as to whether the proposal has met the criteria.

Freitas - There is a program description that lays out program requirements - internship, reflections, specific experiences, etc.
J. Pratt - If you could get us the written criteria for FLIEE approval, by which the committee makes their decision.

N. Gannon - Estimate of programs rejected/accepted.

Freitas - 5/11 were rejected; some based on financial constraints but others because they did not meet the committee's standard of rigor. The proposal is specific to new faculty led programs, not the existing experiences that are covered under the existing rubric.

Physics and astronomy narrative -

J. Pratt - questions or comments about the narrative? Are we comfortable with the recommendation for change in form and direction, given the fact that we don't have control over resources needed to accomplish this?

S. Wical - we also have limited resources from a library standpoint

J. Markgraf - we did agree with the plan to create a strategic plan. The chair disagreed - does that change our position on that issue?

Internal reviewers, dept chair, and dean agreed with items 1-4; 5-8 were from the external reviewer - chair agreed with --- Jean will send me the final spreadsheet; Refer to the reviewer spreadsheet for APC concurrence and disagreement with chair and other parties.

L. Bica - the 2005 APC recommendations suggested development of a strategic plan. Perhaps this would help them to express their needs and address them.

5 votes to concur with the chair for 8d

9-0 vote to change in direction (wording from document)

Report for University Senate on Liberal Education

Under 2 learning experiences to require race, gender, and equity; one must fulfill the UW design for diversity and equity requirement - so that it matches our prior footnote; and so we are in compliance with UW - 3 credit requirement

N. Gannon - do we know how that will work, knowing that one of the two learning experiences must be credit-based (3 credit) and the other part will be experience-based. J. Pratt - it will be a check mark for satisfying the requirement.

J. Pratt - does removing the 'three credit' from design for diversity change our compliance? M. Carney - the provost said this has come up in discussions with other provosts. Not privy to the details.

J. Pratt - 2 stand alone motions? or 1?
L. Bica - current EDI fellows (Canales and Jones) recommend more specific language. Get the wording from Jill - "Text related to the Diversity outcome (Responsibility 1) was inadvertently omitted in the transition from the original liberal education reform proposal to the compromised proposal. The omission obscures the connection between R1 outcome and its corresponding footnote, which references the University Race, Class, Gender, and/or Sexuality Requirement and UW-System's "Design for Diversity" requirement. The UW-System "Design for Diversity" requirement mandates that 3 credits be earned by every student, and until there is a campus-wide consensus and UW-System approval for meeting this requirement by other means, we propose retaining the reference to 3 credits in the language of the outcome."

S. Duckworth-Lawton - we must be explicit about the requirements because people have misunderstood the requirements for Design for Diversity in the past.

Vote on proposing the addition of text back to the outcome (insert motion text) - 9-0.

Insert text 3-credit before the outcome in footnote 4. 7-2

Jerry K. Hoepner, Ph.D., CCC-SLP  
Assistant Professor, Communication Sciences & Disorders University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire  
Sent from my iPad

"It's not what you have that matters but what you do with what you have." Mark Ylvisaker