University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire
University Senate Academic Policies Committee
Vol. 52, Meeting No. 4
Tuesday, October 13, 2015
Council Oak Room, 260 Davies

Present: Members: Selika Duckworth-Lawton, Ned Gannon, Patricia Kleine, Cheryl Lapp, Sean McAleer, Don Mowry, Bob Nowlan, Jean Pratt, Alison Wagener, Stephanie Wical

Guests: Michael Carney, Margaret Cassidy, Doug Dunham, Jennifer Fager, Deb Jansen, Jill Prushiek, Tim Vaughan, Jake Wrasse

Presiding: Chair Jean Pratt called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

1. Approval of Minutes of the 09/29/2015 meeting minutes
   • Motion to approve minutes of September 29, 2015, seconded, approved as distributed.

2. Proposal to eliminate the BSAD Essentials certificate
   • Vaughan attended the meeting to provide information and answer questions.
   • Both the Business Essentials and Health and Aging Services Administration (HASA) certificates were removed from the 2011-2012 catalog because they would require the College of Business to offer low enrollment courses, which can’t be done. The paperwork is now being processed to confirm the decision made five years ago.
   • The motion was made to eliminate the Business Essentials certificate originally listed under the College of Business. Motion was seconded.
     • The Academic Policies Committee, by a vote of 5 in favor and 0 against, on October 13, 2015, recommends that the Business Essentials certificate originally listed under the College of Business be eliminated.

3. Proposal to eliminate the HASA certificate
   • The motion was made to eliminate the Health and Aging Services Administration (HASA) certificate originally listed under the College of Business. Motion was seconded.
     • The Academic Policies Committee, by a vote of 5 in favor and 0 against, on October 13, 2015, recommends that the Health and Aging Services Administration (HASA) certificate originally listed under the College of Business be eliminated.

4. Proposal to establish an MSE (Materials Science and Engineering) course prefix
   • Dunham attended the meeting to provide information and answer questions.
   • Materials Science is requesting the addition of an MSE (Materials Science and Engineering) prefix. It will clearly indicate to ABET (the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) the courses that are engineering-based. The MSCI prefix will continue to be utilized by the program.
   • The motion was made to establish an MSE (Materials Science and Engineering) course prefix to be offered within the Program of Materials Science. Motion was seconded.
     • The Academic Policies Committee, by a vote of 7 in favor and 0 against, on October 13, 2015, recommends an MSE (Materials Science and Engineering) course prefix be offered within the Program of Materials Science.
   • This motion will be forwarded to Senate.

5. Liberal Education Implementation Resolution
   • Critical that administration, faculty, staff, and students participate in any discussions surrounding liberal education.
   • Provost Kleine attended the ULEC meeting yesterday, as she had a lot of questions. She’s reread the proposal and framework and is very supportive of it, finds it exciting. The current issues aren’t only lack of a sufficient number of courses.
Provost asked ULEC who they think should be implementing the framework. The LE Dashboard was created to show the progress, a steering committee used to meet to monitor what’s going on, to talk about implementation issues. Due to change in leadership (e.g. Bill Miller has replaced Marc Goulet as Chair of ULEC), she feels the committee should meet again.

Whose responsibility does APC feel it is? APC, ULEC, Office of Provost, Deans? The Dashboard shows capacity is not being reached for K4, S3, R3, and I1. Do we nudge faculty?

The Dashboard is updated weekly. Blue indicates those outcomes that have been approved and brown indicates those in progress. A separate section of the Dashboard shows the course, who prepared the proposal, the date it was approved, the courses in progress, etc. Courses in progress have been submitted to their perspective college curriculum committee. There is confusion over who is monitoring it: ULEC, Carney, Deans? We don’t know who has full authority.

There are things in the Framework being overlooked; committee membership changes, hard for new members to keep up. For example, both S3 and I1 have the option to be met in the major, but departments haven’t been taking advantage of the opportunity. These things don’t need to be done in the students’ first year, people seem to have forgotten that.

Deliberately chose the word *experiences* for the Framework; items in the Catalog will be coded with reference to the outcome they’ll fill. Both Study Abroad and Blugold Marching Band have been approved. Framework clearly says we’re supposed to look at these things. Student Affairs submitted a proposal, but they were denied with the notion that it needed to be course-based. That isn’t what was passed by Senate.

We celebrate the arts. Non-music majors are able to be involved in these experiences (e.g. Jazz could meet K4) and they should be moved forward.

It hasn’t been APC’s role to gather and assess data, it does seem like we took a much broader view on which of these experiences could count.

English submitted proposals that were sent back without understanding why it was sent back.

Duckworth-Lawton submitted an African American History proposal, which was clearly R1 that was also rejected. The reasoning seemed to be due to a very narrow reading of the rubric. ULEC seems to be reading them literally. Departments are feeling they can’t get their courses through with basic information; something is wrong with the way the proposals are being approved. This is what is causing the hold up and needs to stop.

Cheryl Brandt noted during the ULEC meeting that the proposers are the content experts, trust your collages. This is an excellent point as the proposers are the ones with terminal degrees in their field.

Duckworth-Lawton hasn’t submitted proposals for three History courses because she doesn’t feel they’ll pass, not wanting to waste the time and effort.

Too much focus is being spent on the details of the rubrics. Outcomes should be kept in mind first. If we get bogged down with details, we lose all of the excitement this brings. Supportive of allowing faculty more flexibility in interpreting how their courses might fit into the outcomes versus the rubrics. The first time through will be a pilot, if we’re too prescriptive initially, we’ll lose what’s most important about the change. Rubrics can be altered by ULEC but the outcomes can’t.

Do you think campus is still supportive of the Framework? Think people still support it, but do we think we can provide sufficient capacity?

Provost seems confident in the success of the Framework, where is the naysaying coming from?

- Pratt feels we are placing the University at risk. If the Framework is put in the Catalog as is, it’s similar to a contract. We’re going to make students meet the requirements; however, we’re clearly showing we are lacking seats. Are we going to require all outcomes be met or should a rollout plan be implemented, requiring only those outcomes where capacity has been met. How can we require something we can’t provide? The entire Framework would appear in the Catalog, but the degree audit would only show those outcomes required.
- If we don’t have a plan to ultimately meet capacities, what’s the point? If we’re not going to add more seats or hire more faculty, whose responsibility is it?
- There needs to be a directive from outside of ULEC to reinterpret the process, inform campus that the approval process has been mistakenly restrictive. If the course meets the spirit of the
outcomes (not the rubric), it can fit in the Core. If the process is redirected, it’s possible people will submit proposals.

- Study Abroad is the only experience that has been approved. Blugold Marching Band is connected with a course. If a student fails, they don’t get that experience. If there is no assessment within an experience, how do you insure students are meeting some level of performance? This is part of the struggle ULEC is sensing.
  - Why isn’t a 5-to-10 page reflection enough for the assessment?
- ULEC hasn’t been overly prescriptive. There is always a learning curve when new members begin, but existing members guide them. They would like the proposer to provide some evidence, an artifact (e.g., test or assignment), to show the alignment of the task with the element of the rubric.
- Dean Leaman nudged faculty during the past year. Last semester ULEC members (Angie Stombaugh, Marc Goulet, and Laurel Kieffer) offered to meet with departments to discuss various things they could be doing to put their courses forward and most did not step forward. How hard does ULEC have to push?
- The College of Business pilot tested the rubrics. Rubrics should be tailored to the artifact. They’d like to submit internships but they’re unsure how.
- Is it in appropriate to ask ULEC for a list of possible courses that could be used to meet capacity? May not be possible to create a list.
- In the beginning we discussed that the Framework would allow for development of new courses and new experiences, opportunities to be innovative and experimental. Rubrics seem to stifle academic freedom, people need to use their imagination and creativity to get there.
- The rubrics were helpful for ULEC members to help determine whether the courses submitted were staying true to the Framework.
- Resources have been cut, there are fewer faculty. We need to simplify the process, less is more. In reviewing the approved proposal samples on ULEC’s Web site, they’re verbose. Only one or two sentences under each question should be required.
- Pratt ended discussion; we’re not in a place to make a motion. Members were asked to take this discussion back to their departments. Next Tuesday APC will entertain a motion for either supporting or not supporting the implementation which can then be shared with the Senate Executive Committee.

6. Proposed revisions to the program review process and procedures (time permitting)
   - Due to lack of time, this agenda item was not discussed.

7. Upcoming items
   - Due to lack of time, this agenda item was not discussed.

Chair Jean Pratt adjourned the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Forcier
Secretary for the Meeting