Meeting Minutes

1. **Approval of the 10/13/2015 meeting minutes**
   - Motion to approve minutes of October 13, 2015, seconded, approved as distributed.

2. **Proposed revisions to the program review process and procedures**
   - Carney discussed the change to the Academic Department/Program Review – SELF STUDY.
     - Proposed change to II.4 is to get programs and departments to provide more information and evidence about their assessment plans, the assessment data they’re collecting, and examples of how they’re using the data to improve student learning. The wording is better aligned with UWEC’s upcoming HLC accreditation visit.
     - The motion was made to approve the Academic Department/Program Review – SELF STUDY as indicated in II.4. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by a vote of 9 in favor and 0 against.
   - Potential changes to the program review process and procedures were discussed.
     - All changes will be implemented with the next round of reviews in fall 2016.
     - Given our limited resources and budget constraints, does the external consultant need to always come from outside of Wisconsin and where does funding coming from?
       - Funding provided by Provost’s Office. Exceptions have been made in regards to where external consultants come from; e.g., if two of the three potential consultants are no longer able to participate, and the remaining is from Wisconsin.
     - With AIS, we needed to acknowledge the climate we’re in. Several things were deemed not feasible at the program level; the list of goals needs to be attainable and doable.
     - How can we make this process easier for the department? Is there a way to streamline the process?
     - Disappointed in the Excel document used to summarize the review. Dean is allowed to check boxes but not add specifics. Would rather have a narrative explaining rationale. APC wrote a document that was more complete.
       - The chair does write a narrative; it’s not required by the Dean.
       - If Dean provided a narrative, it would provide additional information to APC so our summary could be better written.
       - We spend a lot of time to get wording right on spreadsheet, wasted time that could be more productively spent working on narrative.
     - Pratt will draft language to share with the Committee next week.
       - Hooper and Duckworth-Lawton were invited to draft language regarding requested changes to the spreadsheet.

3. **Liberal Education Implementation Resolution**
   - The LE Steering Committee met with Provost this morning to discuss the gap and the Dashboard, to determine how it should be addressed. Following their session last night, Student Senate sent a mixed message. They said that as students, they want to be held harmless, but asked that the entire LE Framework be implemented.
   - Pratt asked that APC create a list of pros and cons to distribute to departments, asking for their input.
Because S3 and I1 (decreased from two to one experience) can be met in the major, it is anticipated in-major proposals will increase and the goal will be met. They are now added to the list of “required” outcomes.

During an English Department’s meeting, interest was expressed in determining if there is some flexibility to make the approval process easier.

- ULEC distributed a document during their meeting which indicates only 20 courses have been sent back to departments for revisions. Pratt will distribute the document. The College Curriculum Committees have been able to identify what is likely going to pass ULEC and has been sending proposals back as needed. It also took ULEC time to get things figured out.

- Proposals need be put through, but who’s going to do this? There needs to be some kind of announcement that states the approval process has been streamlined.

- Gannon volunteered to create K4 proposals for English. Not entirely pleased with the framework since the beginning, but believed it was the best we could do. Distauft that S3 and K4 are compromised; it doesn’t honor why they were initially created. The creative and visual arts, music, theatre, creative writing, and poetry were honored to be included and now it can be fulfilled in chemistry and math. Art History courses are currently enrolling 55 students. What will happen if the outcome is removed; feel students won’t take them. Why can’t we find the resources for K4 and implement the entire framework? It seems like we’re close. If we don’t implement it in its entirety now, afraid we’ll move forward and determine we don’t need it. If students aren’t required to take it, they won’t.
  - K4 and R3 aren’t being “cut”. The proposition is that they would still count toward the required 36 credits of LE. There are still majors that require art history; the courses will still be listed in the framework.
  - Only students in a major that requires the courses will take them; only 15 or 20 of the 55 students who enroll in art history are majors. If administration sees the low enrollment, the courses won’t continue. Don’t like the idea of partial implementation, feel it will stay partial long-term and takes away from what we worked so hard on to put through.

- S3 allows for a much larger range of courses/experiences; it’s being narrowly interpreted. We need to make people understand what can be applied there.

- Wording of outcomes will not change.

- Have we asked the departments who proposed courses for K4 if they can add seats?
  - Dean Leaman has asked chairs in Art and Music and Theatre.
    - Is it limited to those departments? Which kinds of courses can apply for K3 and K4? English submitted some of each, but the rubric for K3 seems easier. Perhaps provide clarification for departments who haven’t submitted toward K4.

- Pratt will provide the digital copy of the Report for Senate for committee members to list their pros and cons. She asked that the document be returned to her before Thursday night. She’ll merge them into one document for discussion next week.

- Don’t intend to vote positively for the proposed resolution. Don’t feel it’s the right approach--to start suspending the requirements. It should go forward as is and Deans and Chairs should be responsible for insuring implementation. Would like to see more new courses developed instead of repackaging current courses. Realize it’s a lot of work, but would like to see people be creative and come up with the courses that the faculty said they’d support.

4. Upcoming agenda items

- Continued discussion of the proposed revisions to the program review process and procedures and the liberal education implementation resolution next week.

Chair Jean Pratt adjourned the meeting at 2:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Forcier
Secretary for the Meeting