The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, April 23, 2013 in the Schofield Auditorium.

1) Minutes of April 9, 2013 University Senate meeting approved as amended
   - Room location changed to reflect Schofield Auditorium

2) Administrator Remarks – Chancellor Bousquet
   - Statement(s) from Vice Chancellor Hellwig
     - A letter from the Dean of Students, Brian Carlisle was sent out recently as many of you know, UW-Eau Claire student David Patrick Rodgers, a sophomore mathematics education major, is missing and presumed deceased after falling into the Chippewa River Friday night
       - If anyone is in need of talking to someone, our Counseling Center is available
       - Will continue to work closely with the family and keep everyone informed but the search continues
       - Will be a Day of Remembrance on April 30th in front of Davies Student Center (Rain Day location is Schofield Hall)
   - Statements from Chancellor Bousquet
     - This is a very difficult period for our students so please do not hesitate, if any students show signs of stress, to refer them to the appropriate people
   - UW System cash reserves
     - The entire system has close to 1 billion in cash reserves
     - With the help of Dave Gessner we are getting to the bottom of this for UWEC
     - Will continue to communicate any findings
     - We will get to the bottom of those accounts and get this information available to you
     - What is difficult is the timing as we were just arguing strongly that we needed a pay plan and now this has turned it upside down
     - We are working with our external stakeholders
• Our pay plan is our number one priority
• UWEC has always given the best information that we had at the time
• We will also communicate with the students
• Next week is a special week as we have our first Day of Remembrance on April 30th and will officially welcome Jim Schmidt, our new chancellor
• Have spent the last 10 days in China with the Governor’s delegation
  • Have finalized an agreement with Fudan University School of Nursing in Shanghai
    • Will pursue collaboration in nursing faculty and student exchanges for teaching and research
    • Will work with APC on an implementation agreement
    • Will sign 3 agreements with Hong Kong as well
  • Will have a stronger bridge to China
  • This will expand economic and cultural ties with China and it benefits our students and enhances their global skills

3) Reports
   a) Reports from Committees:
      • None

4) Announcements
   • Everyone is invited to meet and welcome our new Chancellor James Schmidt at the open house in the Dakota Ballroom from 10:30-1:30 with official welcome remarks being held at 11:00
   • On April 30th at noon join the Day of Remembrance to remember all the Blugolds who came before us and have passed away to be held in front of Davies on the plaza.
   • If we recess today’s meeting, we will continue debate at 3:30 in the Woodland Theater on April 30th

5) New Business
   a) First Reading: Motion from Academic Policies Committee
      Academic Concentrations
      Debate
      • None
      Without objection, we will vote on this today
      Continued Debate
      • None
      Vote on Motion 49-AP-16: PASSED without dissention

   b) First Reading: Motion from the University Planning Committee
      Changes in Membership & Function
      Debate
      • None
      Without objection, we will vote on this today
      Continued Debate
      • None
      Vote on Motion 49-MISC-03: PASSED without dissention

   c) First Reading: Motion from the Executive Committee
Changes to Governance Committees: Provided Classified Staff become University Staff on 7/1/13

Debate
- Comment that Senate committees members can be part of a committee but be non-voting and thusly, would not affect a quorum

Without objection, we will vote on this today
Continued Debate
- None

Vote on Motion 49-SE-05: PASSED without dissention

d) First Reading: Joint Motion from the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Academic Staff Personnel Committee
   Search & Screen Selection Process

Debate
- None

Without objection, we will vote on this today
Continued Debate
- None

Vote on Motion 49-FP-03 and 49-AS-01: PASSED without dissention

e) First Reading: Motion from Academic Staff Personnel Committee
   Academic Staff Grievance Procedures

Debate
- None

Without objection, we will vote on this today
Continued Debate
- None

Vote on Motion 49-AS-02: PASSED without dissention

6) Unfinished Business

a) Second Reading: Motion from Academic Policies Committee
   Authorized Absence Policy
   Student Senate Resolution Handout
   Continued Debate
   - None

Vote on Motion 49-AP-15: PASSED
b) Second Reading: Motion from Academic Policies Committee

Liberal Education Reform
Revised LE Core amendment (v.4) from Chairs/Directors

Complete Debate Guideline
Debate Summary

- Comments by Chair Harrison
  - For this meeting please specifically turn your attention to the Debate Summary and Debate Guidelines as distributed and as endorsed by the University Senate Executive Committee
  - I-clickers will be used to facilitate the voting process
    - Be sure your clicker is powered up and displays a blue light prior to casting your vote

Without objection, presentation of an amendment, speaking turns, presentation of specific motions and voting shall be conducted according to the procedural notes described in the Debate Guide and endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee

It has been requested that since many of the decisions to be made today are intertwined, senators be allowed to speak to how a previously decided question or a question to be debated later influences the current debate. Therefore, without objection, the chair will allow speakers to reference past or future topics as long as the comments are generally germane to the current debate

Without objection, the order of debate shall proceed systematically through each of the concepts contained in the main motion as described in the Debate Guide endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee

Without objection, APC’s amendment to change the definition of a Learning Experience (shown in the previously distributed motion) will be presented

Comments from APC Chair Pratt
- Part of working with shared governance is that we can modify things
- Having credit-bearing and the use of the word “faculty” had severe limitations
- Fortunately ULEC, on Friday, passed their provisional process for approving University Liberal Education Learning experiences
- Their rigorous process will ensure that students work is accessible so today APC revised their amendment

Revised Amendment from APC is as follows:

A learning experience comprises specific combinations of learning resources, tools, and activities guided by pedagogical models through which one can identify, to a certain extent, what one has learned. Learning experiences that fulfill students’ liberal education core requirements include both courses and non-course activities. Examples include traditional classroom instruction as well as out-of-the-classroom engagements such as First-Year Seminars and Experiences, Living-Learning Communities, Faculty-Student Collaborative Research, Study and Research Abroad, and Service-Learning. The University Liberal Education Committee (ULEC) is responsible for determining which learning experiences qualify. These Learning experiences are identified in the Undergraduate Catalog by the presence of a code that indicates which liberal education outcome they meet (e.g., K1 for Knowledge Outcome1).

Debate on the amendment of the learning definition
- APC is making an amendment to alter their original definition
  - This would be the definition, if passed, that would be packaged with the full document
  - If one wanted to suggest an alternative amendment then this would be the time
- Assessable and credit-bearing distinction from APC
  - Wanted to include non-curricular experiences
  - Credit bearing is for a learning experience, however, what gets submitted for assessment is a substantial piece of student work and that is why a learning experience can satisfy two outcomes
• Examples of that student work will have to be submitted to ULEC as well as examples of instruction that would support it

VOTE on amendment of the learning definition: PASSED in favor to amend the learning definition (Yes - 27, No - 6)

MOVED by Senator Holmen that we consider an alternative learning experience definition; amendment change fails due to lack of a second

Without objection, the APC amendment to change the implementation phasing and date will now be included in the debate

Amendment from APC is as follows: That the full implementation date would be 2015-2016 with no phasing

Debate on the amendment of the full implementation date and no phasing
• If this is debated and there is a vote of yes then full implementation of Phase 2 (of the original) would be in 2015 - 2016 and if you vote no then it would be two phased: 2015-2016 for the first phase and 2017-2018 for the second phase
• Questioning if this timeframe is feasible for full implementation in 2015
  • If all the courses that will be subject to this change need to go through the curriculum approval process (both at the college level and at the ULEC level) then speaking for the College of Arts & Sciences this is a significant concern
  • Courses of the greatest impact would have to be attended to first and those targeted at freshman and if that is the case then it is probably feasible that we could start with that freshman class
  • Would have to be an understanding that there would be a four year roll out before all students are subject to that program
  • With some planning it may be feasible but still challenging
  • This will be a challenge to all faculty that have courses in this program
  • May need to make modifications
  • The mapping exercise is a strong burden to go through the curricular approval process
• ULEC perspective is that this will be a challenge but it is possible
  • The type of course that will be applying to be part of the liberal education core requires essentially a change in the course other than simply identifying the ways that we meet the outcome and this will be a relatively streamlined process
  • For new courses this is a tough thing to estimate
  • Existing courses might be able to be done by next fall
• For full implementation in 2015-2016 everything must be approved by May of 2014
• For full implementation by the 2015 catalog it is one’s understanding that by October 2014 we should have catalog decisions ready but the Registrar would prefer they have a longer time for such a big change and there are resource issues
  • Because of that some people would like to have a better sense of what courses are actually approved by fall of 2014
  • It would then give us that academic year to get everything ready

VOTE on a full implementation date with one phase in 2015-2016 (with no phasing): DEFEATED (Yes - 15, No – 19), therefore there will be two phases. Phase 1 coming in 2015-2016 and Phase 2 in 2017-18.

Comments from APC Chair Pratt
• We always have options and this is like a parallel implementation with a soft opening before the grand opening of a store
What about if we had the implementation date of Phase 2: 2016-2017 catalog contingent upon sufficient data in fall 2015 to support the full implementation of Phase 2: 2016-2017 catalog.
 That would bypass Phase 1 but gives us one more year to pilot test the framework and by then the mapping activity will have real data.
 As far as assessment we would have one cycle of data for some of the outcomes.
 This is so one could pull catalog copy.
 It gives us opportunity to focus on curricular issues and not under a compressed workload.
 We should have come up with this to start off with.

VOTE on the amendment to have full implementation in the 2016-2017 catalog, with no phasing, contingent upon sufficient data by fall 2015 to support the full implementation: PASSED (Yes – 31, No – 3)

Discussion on when the impact of the requirements would be reviewed
 - Need another review after the implementation is in effect if we want to keep 11 outcomes.

MOVED by Senator Pratt that the Liberal Education program – including the Liberal Education Learning Outcomes on which the Liberal Education program is based – be reviewed four years after implementation catalog, with the potential changes to the program ready for the October Year 5 catalog submission deadline, seconded.

Continued Discussion
 - None
 - 

VOTE on a review being put in place: PASSED (Yes- 31, No – 2)

Debate on the Framework
 - Comments by Chair Harrison
  - APC’s motion and the FULL implementation shown in PHASE 2 of the motion will continue to be the foundation for the debate and considered the default if an amendment for change is defeated.
  - Currently, there are 3 versions of the framework proposed in addition to APC’s version in the main motion. It would help streamline the actual debate process if parts of all versions are allowed to be incorporated simultaneously into the debate.
  - WITHOUT OBJECTION, the alternative framework presented by William Miller and sponsored by Senator Holmen will be included in the debate.
  - WITHOUT OBJECTION, the alternative framework, version 4, presented by the Chairs and Directors and sponsored by the senators who are chairs will be included in the debate.
  - WITHOUT OBJECTION, the alternative framework presented by senators Jones, Canales, and Duckworth-Lawton will be included in the debate.
  - This is an entire replacement of all university requirements.

Debate on a 30 credit minimum (APC default is 40 credits)
 - None as the following amendment was offered.

Amendment from Senator Kaldjian to change the 30 proposed credits to 36, seconded.

Continued discussion on the amendment to the amendment (36 credits)
 - None

VOTE on the amendment to the amendment to have 36 required credits (Yes – 28, No – 6)
Continued discussion on a 36 credit requirement versus 40

- Right now our students go through an undergraduate program and take a certain number of courses and am curious if anyone knows an average number of credits required for the GE program
  - This would be with all the requirements
  - A typical requirement package is between 50 and 60
    - Minimum requirements are 39 but it does not include English and some Math and etc. and Arts and Sciences has a minimum of 45
  - This is for the university minimum

VOTE that the Liberal Education Core minimum of 40 be amended to a minimum of 36: PASSED (Yes – 22, No – 11)

Comment by Chair Harrison on the Knowledge Goal

- The APC default would be that:
  - KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Build knowledge and awareness of diverse peoples and cultures and of the natural and physical world through the study of arts, histories, humanities, languages, mathematics, sciences and technologies, and social sciences.
  - Knowledge 1 (K1): Describe and evaluate models of the natural and physical world through collection and scientific analysis of data, and through the use of mathematical or computational methods. Two learning experiences required, one of which must be a laboratory science.
  - Knowledge 2 (K2): Use knowledge, theories, methods, and historical perspectives appropriate to the social sciences to explain and evaluate human behavior and social institutions. Two learning experiences required.
  - Knowledge 3 (K3): Use knowledge, historical perspectives, analysis, interpretation, critical evaluation, and the standards of evidence appropriate to the humanities to address problems and explore questions.
  - and
  - Knowledge 4 (K4): Use knowledge, historical perspectives, theories, or methods appropriate to the arts to describe their context, function and impact. Two learning experiences required.

- At the workshop, there was general consensus that the Knowledge 3 and Knowledge 4 could be separated

Without objection, Knowledge 3 and Knowledge 4 will be separated with 1 experience being required for each

AMENDMENT by Senator Nowlan to separate the two and have Knowledge 3 with 2 experiences and Knowledge 4 with 1 experience, seconded

Discussion
- Question on if one should vote on resources or on the model that we most strongly support
  - Because the previous amendment made was for a review, then one would want to vote on models because we will be able to then see prior to the 2017 catalog if it is ready to go (but it was later clarified that although one should vote on what they would really like that they should also keep in mind that resources will most likely not change)

AMENDMENT to the AMENDMENT by Senator Nowlan to make a modification to his previous amendment and have K3 with 2 experiences and K4 with 2 experiences, seconded

Discussion on amendment to the amendment
- Comment that Music, Theatre and Dance supports this motion
- Questioning what the con is of letting students choose which area they will follow up in
  - The negative to 1 versus 2 is that it is a risky position as our hallmark to Liberal Education is that it is intentional
- Could be a confusing disaster for “floaters”
- We need more than one exposure to science, social science and the humanities
- Questioning if the idea that one experience in the natural science(s) would satisfy our promise of producing individuals who are liberally educated and ready to go out into the world
  - We need to have a greater number of experiences as we want to put out well educated, liberally educated students
  - Going to 2, 2, 2, 2, would require all of our students to get as much exposure to as many disciplines as they can
- Questioning if the Arts could meet two experiences
- A lot of details yet to be worked out
- There is a potential to be able to meet this but nothing that is firm as there are still a lot of questions
- Music, Theatre and the Dance Department will be able to meet the 2 experiences as the curriculum is being revised on a regular basis toward this
- Looking at this reform in terms of what our students currently have problems with and how can we address those problems going forward
  - Given that many GE Requirements are met with 100 or 200 level classes and the provisional application for inclusion in the LE Core states that prerequisites will be minimal, then we can all acknowledge that all these will be met with mainly low level classes
  - We should ask what the students remember about their GE classes when they aren’t directly related to their major or minor
  - The experience they go through will allow them to regain that knowledge later but the opposition is to the 8 knowledge experience requirements
  - Firm belief that the biggest problem facing this campus is not knowledge based and this is not what we need to be focusing on
  - The expansion of knowledge is a virtuous goal but the more we expand the knowledge requirements the more pressure there will be to reduce skills, responsibility or integration
  - Those are more important to address the problems that we see in terms of where our students come from, what they see and where they are going
- One cannot question the value of low level courses
- Should not separate knowledge from skills as this would be an artificial separation
- Skills and wisdom for life is in the knowledge area
- This new framework does not expand the knowledge courses that our students are required to take even with the 2, 2, 2, 2
- 100 and 200 level courses can serve as a basis of learning for other issues but it is the upper level courses that students bloom and learn in depth
- We need a solid foundation first
- Clarification that voting in favor of this amendment to the amendment would give you 2 experiences in K3 and 2 experiences in K4 and if you vote in opposition then you would have 2 experiences in K3 and 1 experience in K4

**VOTE on amendment to the amendment to have 2 experiences in K3 and 2 experiences in K4: PASSED (Yes – 22, No – 11)**

- Clarification prior to next vote: If voting in favor then will have 2 experiences in K3 and 2 experiences in K4 or if one votes in opposition then would have 1 experience in K3 and 1 experience in K4

**VOTE on amendment to have 2 experiences in K3 and 2 experiences in K4: PASSED (Yes – 25, No – 8)**

Without objection, meeting is recessed at 4:47 p.m. and will resume on April 30th, 2013 at 3:30 p.m. in the Woodland Theatre
Members Present:
Cindy Albert, Julie Aminpour, Cathy Berry, Lori Bica, Janice Bogstad, Mary Canales, Selika Ducksworth-Lawton, Doug Dunham, Julie Eklund, Jeff Erger, Steve Fink, Mitchell Freymiller, Ned Gannon, Jeffrey Goodman, Gail Hanson Brenner, Susan Harrison, Beth Hellwig, Jerry Hoepner, Jay Holmen, Phil Ihinger, Robin Johengen, Ryan Jones, Paul Kaldjian, Lee-Ellen Kirkhorn, Patricia Kleine, Fred Kolb, Mary La Rue, Paula Lentz, Lauren Likkel, Jill Markgraf, Mike Morrison, Don Mowry, Bob Nowlan, Geoffrey Peterson, John Pollitz, Jean Pratt, Lisa Schiller, Patti See, Sherrie Serros, Linda Spaeth, Johannes Stroschänk, Ganga VadHAVKAR, Theresa Wells, Kurt WIEGEL, Katie Wilson, Lynn Wilson, Jerry Worley, Rama Yelkur

Members Absent:
Jason Anderson, Jon Bollinger, Gilles Bousquet, Julia Diggins, Chip Eckardt, Todd Glaser, Ann Hoffman, John Lee, Karl Markgraf, Jason Mathwig, Rick Mickelson, Pat Montanye, Joe Morin, Rob Reid, Kate Reynolds, Jeri Weiser, Sharon Westphal, Odawa White, Becky Wurzer

Guests:
David Baker, Debra Barker, Jim Boulter, Margaret Cassidy, Bernard Duyfhuizen, Jennifer Fager, Debbie Gough, Marc Goulet, Deb Jansen, Kate Lang, Vanessa Murphy, Teresa O’Halloran, Tessa Perchinsky, Jill Prushiek, David Shih, Reiko Shinno, Kent Syverson, Evan Weiher, Michael Weil, Marty Wood

The recessed meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 2013 in the Woodland Theatre.

- Chair Harrison gave a summary of what took place at our last meeting
- With permission, Chair Harrison would like to address the following:
  - Response to “what does the 2016-2017 implementation date mean in terms of assessment” provided by Director of Assessment, Jennifer Fager, and Chair of University Liberal Education Committee, Marc Goulet: {text below provided in written form to the Senators}
    - As you know, we are accredited by the Higher Learning Commission. As an obligation of accreditation we are required to meet the criteria the Commission has set for us. Further, as you are aware, the criteria for accreditation have been changed and the process for accountability has higher expectations that include responsibilities for meeting the criteria.
    - Given the 2016-2017 implementation schedule for the proposed liberal education framework, we felt that the following may be of use to the Senate.
      - Our next visit from the Higher Learning Commission will be in 2019-2020. At that time the team, on behalf of the Commission, will review UW-Eau Claire using the Criteria for Accreditation and evaluate our work since the 2009 visit. This review will also include our focus on any identified areas needing improvement including the need to address assessment of our general education program (p. 38 of the Assurance Section of the Report of a Comprehensive Evaluation Visit).
      - The Criteria for Accreditation state, "The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning (4.B)." Since 2009 we have not accomplished as much as we should have done to systematically assess the current general education program and the university graduation requirements.
      - The 2016-2017 implementation data underscores the need to assess our current general education and university graduation requirements as the evidence will assist in the process for approving and assessing courses under the new framework. Additionally, we would likely not be reviewed favorably if we were to ignore the previous charge and not engage in assessment of general education and our other programmatic offerings for a 5-7 year period.
• Discussion on the above written comments:
  • Questioning what conclusion(s) the senators should take from their statements as it is interpreted as a warning of potential difficulties that the implementation date of 2016-2017 might raise for assessment and not sure if it is suggesting that we revisit what we discussed at the last Senate meeting
    • Not necessarily more challenging
    • The implementation date gives more time to establish a good core and therefore, a good assessment plan for that core
    • The reality of waiting until 2016-2017 we will be 7 years into the last HLC site visit and we cannot wait that long to assess liberal education/general education
    • We will have to, beginning next year, perform an assessment of the existing general education program
  • Questioning why are we not doing assessment as it is a parallel system
    • We can collect assessment data on GE and we now have more time for ULEC to be able to start processing through courses that will become part of whatever framework of Liberal Education that gets approved but we can start assessing those before 2016
    • This should not impede assessment at all and could do it as almost a pilot study
      • It was one’s understanding that while ULEC is approving for GE they already have a process that they are revising and refining for LE
      • Faculty could then start developing the instruction and student work that would be submitted/assessed
    • We could be well on our way with assessment even before 2016

• Response to “what does the 2016-2017 implementation date mean in terms of the Registrar”
  • Written text provided by Registrar Tessa Perchinsky

**Liberal Education Reform Implementation Timeline**

**Implementation for 2016-2017 Catalog**

Draft timeline provided by Registrar Tessa Perchinsky

---

**Registrar’s Office Prep (operational, degree audit-graduation requirements, catalog)**

**September 2016**
- *Liberal Education Reform launched*

**June 2016**
- *Freshman Orientation*
  - published 2016-2017 undergraduate catalog with liberal education requirements distributed

**Spring 2016**
- *Catalog Publication*
  - catalog printed; “online” catalog on Registrar’s website by commencement

**April-May 2016**
- *Priority Registration for Fall 2016*
  - Transfer student orientation/registration – graduation requirements need to be coded on 2016 degree audit prior to transfer orientation to reflect the new liberal education requirements

**Fall 2015**
- *Catalog Publication*
  - Course Roll from Catalog to Schedule for Fall 2016
    - IMPORTANT NOTE: All Attributes MUST be in place and coded.
  - Department Chairs and Associate Deans review course descriptions and text for 2016-2017 undergraduate catalog
  - Course Masters from Curriculum Committees required for Fall 2016
### Summer 2015

**PeopleSoft Curriculum Maintenance**
- Coding of courses with new attributes

**PeopleSoft Degree Audit Development**
- Degree Review coding of graduation requirements for the 2016-2017 undergraduate catalog

### Framework

*(course attributes, graduation requirements, resource determination, data review)*

Ensure all approval processes are complete prior to proceeding with operational portion of implementation.

### Spring 2015

Final revisions, resource allocations, determining course offerings, and finalized liberal education degree requirements complete.

### February 2015

**Review of data and resource for full implementation for 2016-2017 calendar**

Request to amend the data review from Fall 2015 to February 2015
- Implementation Date would be in the 2016-2017 Catalog, contingent upon sufficient data by Fall February 2015 to support full implementation of Phase 2 (i.e., just Phase 2 of the two-phase proposal, skipping Phase 1).

### Fall 2014 to Summer 2013

Finalization of coursework specific to the new liberal education. Define the course attributes per liberal education framework, determine the liberal education degree requirements per college based on the framework, and determine the course offerings and resources needed.

### May 2013

University Senate approves Liberal Education Reform (tentative)

- Permission given to Registrar Perchinsky to briefly explain the above timeline
  - Implementation date is appreciated as there is much prep work that goes into a change this significant
  - Registrar Perchinsky asked that we consider a motion for the timetable and amend from Fall 2015 to February 2015
    - There would still be enough time for data collection

Discussion on timetable
- No dates are being altered

MOVED by Senator Bogstad that we allow this motion to be opened back up to consider the change then consider amending the implementation timetable from Fall 2015 to February 2015, seconded

VOTE to allow reconsideration of a change: PASSED (Yes, 33, No – 3)

Continued Discussion
- None

AMENDMENT by Senator Berry to change the implementation timeline date from Fall 2015 to February 2015, seconded

Continued Discussion on Implementation Timetable Date Change
- The University Senate would decide if there were sufficient data
VOTE to allow amendment and implementation timetable date change from Fall 2015 to February 2015: PASSED (Yes – 33, No – 2)

• Response to EDI fellows’ (DJ, MC, SD-L) request for their proposal to be withdrawn from consideration
  • {Provided in written form: “We withdraw the EDI Fellows reform model out of appreciation for the effort and time that the APC has spent in developing their proposal through a multi-year, inclusive process, working with nationally prominent models for LE reform, and working closely with the UWEC community to create a local model. We also recognize that the Academic Chairs and Deans have amended their proposal to require student experiences for Responsibility Outcome 1 that go at least beyond the 3-credit minimum that is mandated by UW-System. After continuing consideration, however, we fully support the APC model that, in our view, clearly values the need for substantial student experiences related to all four of the newly adopted liberal education goals: knowledge, skills, responsibility, and integration.”

Without Objection, accept request for EDI fellows (DJ, MC, SD-L) proposal to be withdrawn from consideration

• Clarification of Chair’s previous statement regarding “voting one’s hopes”.
  • The goal of revising the graduation requirements and the liberal education core is to provide the best opportunity possible to foster in the students “creativity, critical insight, empathy, and intellectual courage, the hallmarks of a transformative liberal education and the foundation for active citizenship and lifelong learning.” It is with that goal in mind, one should cast one’s vote.
  • However, in this age of budget constraints, no decision goes without consequences. Regardless of which set of graduation requirements are approved, resources may need to be reallocated to support the offering of the courses or experiences to meet the requirements. In my calculation, our existing graduation requirements, regarding GE and competencies, requires about 13 to 15 distinct courses averaging 3 credits each. The three proposed sets of graduation requirements involve 11 to 21 potentially overlapping experiences, varying from 0 to 5 credits each.
  • Dean Baker has agreed to respond to “what resources are currently allocated to provide adequate seats in courses to support the current GE and competencies graduation requirements.”
  • Permission to allow Dean Baker to briefly provide information about resources

Comments from Dean Baker on what resources are currently allocated to provide adequate seats in courses to support the current GE and competencies graduation requirements

• To ensure that all of our students can fulfill the core requirement we need to accommodate 1250 seats per experience per semester
  • So an outcome that meets one experience would be required to have 2500 seats for the academic year
  • An outcome meeting two experiences would be at a minimum of 5000 seats for the academic year
  • We can project available seats based on our recent course mapping exercise and on course availability history
  • Until ULEC actually approves experiences, makes decisions about experiences fulfilling multiple outcomes and also defines framework components such as integration these are indeed projections
  • Based on experience we know that we won’t have problems meeting some of the outcomes and others we do not have the capacity to address at this time
  • We know that if multiple outcomes can be addressed by courses or other kinds of experiences then we can make progress with some of the outcomes that we currently do not have capacity for, others may require a new pedagogy or require the actual reallocation of resources
  • The College is prepared to reallocate resources if needed but it is seen as a last resort
  • Want to emphasis that if additional resources are needed those are resources that would be largely in the College of Arts & Sciences
  • New resources and external resources are not available
  • Questioning if Integrative goals cover the underlying goals
    • A decision ULEC will need to address
• Statement from Chair Harrison that we can recess and come back on May 7th but then the May 7th meeting would have to take place finals week (Thursday at 5 p.m.) as we have a full agenda already scheduled
• Chair Harrison asked for confirmation on the debate process
  • Asked if senators wanted to choose an option then tweak as we go through or continue as we have been and take it goal by goal
  • We shouldn’t revise the process that we have already been following
  • There was an objection to changing the process
  • Why does the APC default prevent us from looking at this holistically
• Chair was looking at a more efficient way of proceeding

VOTE to keep the APC proposal as the default and continue the process previously agreed upon: PASSED (Yes - 28, No – 8)

Proposal to change K1 to 1 experience and K2 to 1 experience or keep the APC default of 2 experiences each
• Discussion on changing to 1 experience
  • K1, K2, K3, K4 should all have one experience with the option of floaters
    • Should try to balance priorities and needs
    • Want to give flexibility to faculty and students in meeting their liberal education
    • Workload is also important
    • If all “1’s” then there is a need for good advising and working with our students on a plan that works with them and is best for them
    • Should and cannot be our universities responsibility to solve society’s ills
    • We have an opportunity through good advising and some flexibility to really make things come alive for our students
    • Should not be an accounting procedure
  • In favor of keeping it as the 2, 2, 2, 2 as articulated by APC
    • Accept observations made in previous comments about low level courses but the question is what do we do about that
    • We need to clearly articulate what we value in a quality liberal education and requiring only 1 experience sinks us below the level of the online 2 year associate arts degree from the UW System and that is a risky proposition
    • Wisconsin employers are looking for our graduates to have more than that
    • The solution to the problem is embedded in the new framework as it is right now
    • The second hallmark of our framework is assessment and it needs to have a chance
    • Let’s give the process a chance to work before we resort only allowing a token exposure to how humanities solves problems
  • Support the 1, 1, 1 with 3 options as the arts can’t support 2 experiences
    • Many people will have a second science as an option but it gives equality for those that want that second art or fine arts class
    • The floaters give our students some options and they can take ownership in their education
    • Students shouldn’t have hoops to jump through
    • It levels the playing field and it makes the arts feel equal

Chair Harrison stated that many of the speakers are taking this as a package so she is wondering if there is any objection to taking this as a package: 1 experience plus 3 versus the default of APC, which is 2, 2, 2, 2
• Since we already decided at last week’s Senate meeting that we wanted 2 experiences in K3 and 2 experiences in K4 so we should address K1 and K2

Continued discussion
• Having two in each category encourages reinforcement

MOVE the previous question and close debate, seconded
VOTE to move the previous question and close debate: PASSED (Yes – 32, No – 3)

VOTE to amend K1 to 1 experience and K2 to 1 experience: FAILED (Yes - 9, No- 26) so we will have 2 experiences in K1 and K2

The default is that the lab science must be from K1.

Amendment proposed by the other 2 options that the lab science could either be from K1 or K2, seconded

Debate on placement of lab science
• None

VOTE to amend that the lab science can float between K1 or K2: PASSED (Yes – 26, No – 8)

Was previously presented: Lab science required but not associated with anything: Not Seconded

Currently we are looking at 2 experiences each in K1, K2, K3, K4 with a lab choice in either K1 or K2

AMENDMENT to change K4 to 1 experience, seconded

Discussion on amendment to change K4 to one experience
• Ideal models can’t be supported
• Resources would have to be reallocated in the department of Arts & Sciences
  • No statement have been made to that effect in Senate
  • In the statement from Dean Baker regarding resources he stated: should 2 experiences be required that we would find a way to responsibly pull that off
• Comment that one should vote their wishes here and we can trim back when we revisit this
• We need to think outside the box
  • The current resources is with courses and this program is not course based
  • There are many other experiences and we can be creative and meet some demands
  • This program may allow overlap and experiences that are co-curricular or non-credit bearing
• The last discussion was rounded in vision and not driven by resources
  • Is appropriate at a fundamental level

MOVE the previous question and debate would be closed, seconded

VOTE to move the previous question and close debate: PASSED (Yes – 32, No – 3)

VOTE to amend K4 to 1 experience or K4 with 2 experiences: FAILED (Yes – 12, No – 23) so will stay with 2 experiences in K4

• The default for Skills is at S1: 2 experiences, including writing, S2: 1 experience including math, S3: 1 experience for creativity
• No second made for a 1, 1, 1 option

Without objection S2 and S3 with 1 experience each

• Previously requested
  • Request to consider unlinking the writing requirement from S1, no second
  • Request to unlinking the math requirement from S2, no second
Currently we have S1 with 2 experiences, including writing, S2 with 1 experience, including math, computation and statistics, and S3 with 1 experience

Further discussion on skills

- None

- Responsibility Goal as the default has 2 experiences, specifically stating that there will be 6 credits, of which 3 is diversity for R1; 2 experiences, 3 credits for R2; and 2 experiences, 1 of which would include Service Learning for R3
  - No second to recommend that it be reduced to 1 credit for R1

**MOVED that R1 not specify 6 credits but still specify diversity, seconded**

- Should be within course credit as there is significant social science research that shows when we are dealing with race, sexuality and gender that if it is not contextualized with content that is rigorous experiences can reinforce stereotypes
  - Urge you to keep it at 6 credits as experiences need to be of rigorous academic content
  - Sends an inappropriate signal that some things need to be credit and others don’t
  - Campus experts gave input that shaped all of the decision on the APC proposal and there has been countless hours of deliberation on proposal components
    - It was campus experts that informed the proposal where multiple experiences were needed for students to earn the foundation knowledge that they needed and also where course credits were needed
    - The research evidence is clear that if experiences are not connected to course content then there are adverse consequences for students
    - This issue has not been treated equally or effectively on how credits are defined, outlined and executed and it lags behind how other experiences have been called out

**VOTE to amend that R1 not specify 6 credits, but still specify diversity: FAILED (Yes – 12, No – 22) so 6 credits in R1**

**AMENDMENT that there be 1 experience be required in each of R2 and R3, seconded**

Discussion on amendment

- Service Learning in R3 comments
  - The mapping exercise for Arts & Sciences showed a figure of 4% but that does not mesh with other records
  - From June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2012 (and counting 15 credit or ½ as ½ and adding them together) 992 students completed service learning projects
    - Through the credit option (course embedded) 1846 for a combined total of 2838
  - Have a strong service learning program and it generates a lot of community connection and it should build on our strengths and include that as one of the experiences for R3
  - If you look at the guidelines for service learning it already has a detailed mission statement, goals and objectives and outcomes that could easily be adopted to the AACU outcome for civic engagement
  - It really speaks to our overall mission of creating people who become citizens and lifelong learners
  - College of Business graduates, five years out, volunteer at twice the rate of the national average for their age group
  - Reducing R3 to 1 is not very aspirational
  - The R2 global is as important as any knowledge goal as our students move into a diverse world and out students need to have an understanding of our global environment
  - Want students to understand there is not normal and wrong but there is difference and diversity between and among people, locally, nationally and globally
Our students do not know that when they come here and they don’t apply it when they are here and if you listen to the experience of diverse students on campus and when they go to the workplace then we realize they are not applying it

Speaking for R2 and assessing global learning

- 1 experience for R2 means someone can go on spring break to Germany for 1 week and be done with their global learning and meet this requirement
- We would be doing an injustice to our students and research shows that such a short term experience tends to encourage stereotypes
- Our students are very impressionable and absorb everything like sponges so we really need to prepare them to function in a pluralistic society and accelerate global learning as our Goal 3 of our Centennial Plan says and give them multiple perspectives

Language does not reoccur in the learning goals so here we have this chance

We need to give people a reason to stay

We included all of the final recommendation into our new LE core curriculum: We see, we act, we work towards excellence and doing this will be a clear statement and we can sell to current and future students, faculty, staff, and administrators, etc.

VOTE to amend to 1 experience for R2 and 1 experience for R3: FAILED (Yes – 6, No – 29) so there will be 2 experiences in R2 and 2 experiences in R3

No desire to unlink diversity in R1

MOVED that R3 be changed to 1 experience and that Service Learning be kept outside the core, seconded

Discussion on moving service learning outside the core:

- Service learning has many good things about it and has good expectations
- Having this outside the core doesn’t prevent one from putting together a R3 course and a service learning component
- Was not APC’s intention that it had to be a course
- It depends on ULEC how many outcomes will be allowed per course
- A K class could have 2 or 3 outcomes, depending on what ULEC decides
- Any of the R’s will overlap any of the K or S courses and already do overlap
- Questioning if it possible to have a K2 class with a service learning component but not be required to have an R3 outcome
- You could have service learning attached to it and choose not to have it hit the R3 and then choose not to do the assessment that would associated with the R3
  - That did not come through then because by listing it as an R3 the Registrar would expect a course to meet R3 experience, one of which, would be Service Learning
  - It can be an add on
  - If it is linked to R3 then one would have to be assessed to meet the R3 outcomes, as it is stated right now
- It is possible for a course that is offered to satisfy K2, as part of the Liberal Education Core, to also satisfy service learning requirements in R3
- A service learning course seems integral to responsibility
- Service learning can be part of a course
- If we are critical of some of the service learning projects then we have to look at ourselves
- Should stress more civic engagement
- Service learning is a keystone for some colleges
- If one wants their class to get R3 credit then you have to do the assessment
  - If you want to do service learning for the major or for any other reason you can still do service learning but it would not get R3 credit without the assessment
- Students would have to take a class or experience associated with R3 to get graduation credit
The question was called

VOTE to amend so that Service Learning would be outside the core and that R3 be reduced 1: FAILED (Yes – 11, No – 22) so Service Learning will stay associated with R3 and R3 will maintain 2 experiences

Chair Harrison moved to adjourn without objection the meeting at 5:01 and continue discussion at 3:00 p.m. on May 7, 2013.

OBJECTION raised to the move to adjourn

- Inquiry made if restricted from continuing debate for any reason
- No restrictions existed as long as quorum remained
- Therefore, debate continued

Amendment that the wording .... and one of which must contain a wellness component, be added to R3, seconded

Discussion on wellness component:

- Wellness is a significant societal and personal issue
- An individual’s unhealthy behaviors decrease quality of life, life expectancy and our broader society incurs financial and social costs
- Including wellness would meet the intent of the liberal education framework
- What we currently have in place is inadequate
- Need to take these issues more seriously
- Existing requirements are inadequate
  - No one has submitted a proposal trying to address this
  - This is urgently needed
  - Student Affairs resources do not support this and it is feared that it won’t be addressed but it will deteriorate before it is addressed
    - We need to address wellness but not in the LE core
  - Against having another LE core requirement as we can address it elsewhere
  - This are intricately related
  - We need to improve what is available
  - Concerned that if we eliminate the physical requirement and the wellness requirement and we have a shortage of counselors as well as the potential changes to Health Services it sets us up to disproportionately affect the health of our students
  - Questioning why we couldn’t create and define later if we carved out a space for it now
    - A definition of a wellness experience was previously distributed now read by Katie Wilson
  - If we vote in favor so that one of the R3’s contains a wellness component and we already voted that one of the R3’s contain a Service Learning Component that means that we have taken away flexibility to the R3 category

VOTE that one experience in R3 contain a wellness component: FAILED (Yes – 9, No – 14) so no wellness component will be required

- The default for Integration is that 3 integrative learning experiences be required

MOVED that the Integrative learning experiences be dropped to 2, seconded

Discussion on experiences being dropped to 2:

- Integration definition was read
• Could include if what is proposed meets ULEC approval and application requirements for meeting one of these outcomes
• Speaking for 3 experiences as we need strong integrative learning
  • Also follows a $1.73 million dollar grant awarded by the federal government in the form of Title III
  • Are using that grant to develop integrative learning, global learning and multicultural learning on our campus
  • Intentional program design and intentional course design is necessary to achieve the integrative learning outcomes
  • The need for 3 learning experiences is compatible with both our local and national data to date

VOTE that Integrative Learning be reduced to 2 experiences: FAILED (Yes – 9, No – 16) so Integrative Learning experiences will remain at 3

• Package as it stands was presented
• Amendment requiring completion of all this core prior to the end of a students’ sophomore year, not seconded
• Inquiry how to raise minimum credits up to 40
• Only one who voted on the prevailing side (voted yes to lower the credits to 36) may move to reconsider
• An amendment presented to edit phrasing in the Learning Goals and outcomes but the Learning goals and Outcomes are not on the floor at this time; ruled out of order.
  • When this comes up for review that would be the time to present the motion

Question on the main motion as amended, VOTE: PASSED (Yes – 23, No – 2)

SUMMARY OF GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS FOR BACCALAUREATE DEGREES as amended
Credit Requirements
  Minimum total for graduation ................................................................. 120 credits
  NOTE: Certain programs exceed this minimum.
  Upper division credits (courses numbered 300 and higher) ...................... 39 credits
  Liberal education core ........................................................................ a minimum of 36 credits

LIBERAL EDUCATION CORE REQUIREMENTS
Knowledge Goal
  Knowledge Outcome 1 (one in K1 or K2 must be a laboratory science)........ 2 learning experiences
  Knowledge Outcome 2 (one in K1 or K2 must be a laboratory science)........ 2 learning experiences
  Knowledge Outcome 3 ............................................................................. 2 learning experiences
  Knowledge Outcome 4 ............................................................................. 2 learning experiences

Skills Goal
  Skills Outcome 1 (one must meet University Writing requirement)........... 2 learning experiences
  Skills Outcome 2 (by end of sophomore year to meet Math/State requirement)..... 1 learning experience
  Skills Outcome 3 .................................................................................. 1 learning experience

Responsibility Goal
  Responsibility Outcome 1 (six credits course-based learning, meeting Diversity req.)..... 2 learning experiences
  Responsibility Outcome 2 (one must be 3 credits of course-based learning) .......... 2 learning experiences
  Responsibility Outcome 3 (one must meet Service Learning)...................... 2 learning experiences

Integration Goal
  Integration Outcome 1 ............................................................................. 3 learning experiences

• The remaining items, to be introduced and seconded, will be presented at the next University Senate meeting

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

Submitted by,
Tanya Kenney
Secretary to the University Senate