University of Wisconsin — Eau Claire

University Senate Academic Policies Committee
Vol. 52, Meeting No. 6
Tuesday, October 27, 2015
Chancellors Room, 311 Davies

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

Guests: Margaret Cassidy, Jennifer Fager, Deb Jansen, Tessa Perchinsky, Tim Vaughan, Jake Wrasse

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

Meeting Minutes

1. Approval of the 10/20/2015 meeting minutes
   - Motion to approve minutes of October 20, 2015, seconded, approved as distributed.

2. Proposed revisions to the program review process and procedures
   - The suggested changes to the Process and Procedures for Academic Department/Program Review from last week’s meeting were individually discussed.
     - It was agreed that it would be beneficial for Pratt to provide copies of the Program Review Final Reports from Academic Affairs to the Committee.
   - The motion was made to accept the changes to the Process and Procedures for Academic Department/Program Review as discussed and edited. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by a vote of 8 in favor and 0 against.
   - Pratt will forward the updated document to Wanda Schulner.

3. Liberal Education Implementation Resolution
   - Seems we have come to a philosophical impasse: faculty feel resources should be made available by administration; during the past three years, administration has been saying no additional resources would be provided; students prefer the framework be implemented in its entirety but want to be held harmless during the transition.
   - ULEC’s voted on the implementation resolution and it passed by only one vote; it was determined broader input is needed. APC created a list of pros and cons, laying out all discussions, to share with faculty and staff.
   - Changes to the Report for the University Senate regarding Liberal Education Implementation were discussed:
     - CETL continues to offer assistance to those that wish to propose courses for any outcome.
     - Pratt shared a spreadsheet showing the yearly increase in the number of students unable to attain the physical activity and/or wellness requirement.
       - The Physical Activity requirement issue shouldn’t be included on the Report, it’s already been vetted by faculty to be cut from LE, talk of elimination is occurring. However, K4, S3, and I were discussed and vetted and it was agreed to include them in the framework. Feel “In one week, S3 went...” should not be eliminated. There are courses that could apply for K4, there just hasn’t been enough clarity or motivation to do so. If administration wants to find K4 seats, they’ll help us find them. It’s understood that additional teaching resources aren’t going to be added. Also understand that S3 can be completed in the major, we’re short a significant amount. If we leave K4 behind, there’s no motivation to find the courses; whereas there’s a strong motivation right now to bring them forward and pass the framework through in its entirety. If we think courses are going to be there in a year, why isn’t it happening now?
     - There’s some thought that the numbers being used for the dashboard are off. If they’re LE courses, they may increase in size and ULEC has been estimating on past enrollment. We will continue to create and submit applications, everything doesn’t need to be in place by fall 2016. Most students will be using preexisting Catalogues. We have time.
     - An error in the first document emailed by APC caused confusion regarding K4 and S3. K4 was designed for the arts and can be completed in the major as long as the course is open to the students across in other departments (i.e., minimal prerequisites). S3 is designed for creative activity outside of the arts and can be completed within the major by majors-only students (S3 and Integrative Learning in capstone courses, for instance).
Don’t want to be prescriptive to faculty (say one year). No one motivated our department to submit K4. If we don’t put an end date, it could go indefinitely.

Not in favor of holding off on implementation. Gene Hood’s email indicated that no one asked him what student capacity can be in ARTH courses. It’s not widely known on campus how much we’re short and where. Don’t think there’s been pressure on departments. We need to evaluate the shortages and discuss what we can do to meet them. This discussion needs to go beyond us—Senate, faculty, and chairs haven’t provided their input.

Very little difference between S3 and K4. People seem to have an issue with what the difference means in terms of what they can submit. They’re seeing differences in rubrics.

Don’t see why we don’t consider postponing the entire framework instead of parts of it. We worked very hard to put it together as a total package; we can’t remove bits and pieces. Worried it will be a different framework. Don’t like the idea of putting it in the Catalog when we’re saying we don’t have the resources to meet it. Why not postpone it one year? Agree that Senate should talk about where we are in meeting requirements and discussion should occur in departments. Don’t understand why this has to be in the form of a motion and not just a discussion item.

We’re so close to LE, we shouldn’t hold the entire thing up.

As of September 1st, Registration was told to proceed with the framework; it would not be suspended and would go forward. We can’t back out now, transfer students have already been admitted.

This is a liberal arts institution and state budget cuts have resulted in cuts to the arts. Will continue to speak against it. It’s a reduction even if we’re just pushing it off. Being told K4 can occur when we find time and energy—it’s not acceptable for a liberal arts institution. Suspending K4 isn’t right. Credits will be filled by courses students have to take, there will be no room for ARTH.

We can’t suddenly require one GE IVA course for each student when we’ve never before required it before. We’re approximately 800 seats short. People haven’t been asked as to whether they can serve more students. This would be the first thing to investigate, see how capacities can be increased. Before we approve this, we need to talk to departments to see what can be done. Not convinced that we can’t make it, we need to ask them.

Understand that increasing capacity in an option, but the number one reason many students choose UWEC is due to the smaller class sizes, getting to know professor, it’s a huge component of UWEC. Know times are tough, but increasing class sizes shouldn’t be the first option.

First step shouldn’t be too increase sizes. We should look at courses that qualify for K4—it should be fairly systematic to determine what qualifies. We haven’t considered the breadth of what K4 can include; shouldn’t only be looking at music and art.

During the 2.5 years we spent working on the framework this was all taken into account. We determined we did and would have the capacity. May be due to the fact that we have fewer resources and will continue to have fewer.

Chair Pratt will add comments from today’s meeting to the Report. She’ll circulate the revised document to committee members via email for comments and then it will be sent to all departments.

Should share with departments their original capacity estimates and see if those numbers have changed. Chairs should be told if we can identify additional courses in their area.

Would also ask chairs and faculty to see if they can envision any new courses (with minimal prerequisites) and to keep submitting proposals.

4. Upcoming agenda items
   - Due to lack of agenda items, next week’s meeting has been canceled.

Chair Jean Pratt adjourned the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Forcier
Secretary for the Meeting