University of Wisconsin – Eau Claire
University Senate Academic Policies Committee
Vol. 52, Meeting No. 14
Tuesday, March 29, 2016
Council Oak Room, 260 Davies

Present: Members: Janice Bogstad, Mike Carney, Selika Duckworth-Lawton, Ned Gannon, Jerry Hoepner, Bob Hooper, Cheryl Lapp, Sean McAleer, Bob Nowlan, Jean Pratt, Mathew Riedel

Guests: Margaret Cassidy, Deb Jansen, David Jewett, David Jones, Jill Prushiek

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

Meeting Minutes

1. Approval of the 03/15/2016 meeting minutes
   - Motion to approve minutes of March 15, 2016, seconded, approved as distributed.

2. Political Science program review memo
   - Peterson would like APC to reconsider the recommendation that states that a full assessment plan must be completed and submitted prior to the end of fall 2016 and a five-year curriculum-revision and staffing plan must be completed and submitted prior to the end of spring 2017. Committee is not inclined to do so.
   - Edit to #2 on second page – eliminate the ‘ in supports
   - Motion was made to distribute the Political Science program review memo with the minor edit. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by a vote of 8 in favor and 0 against.

3. Liberal Studies program review
   - Jones was in attendance to provide information and answer questions
   - Question – Has anything changed that you’d like us to know about?
     - Only three courses offered. ULEC approved 201 and 301 for the IL designation and 480 was approved for S3, working on curricular alignment
     - Peace Corp Prep certificate program launched
   - Question – Can see that advising is really intense and appreciate the recommendation that the director should be a stable position. Students need it, shouldn’t have to keep adjusting to turnover. Internal report seemed to send a contradictory message against changing major to less than 60 credits, yet feel program should be expanded. Does it mean development of more courses or to deepen relationship between 201 and 301?
     - More intentional relationship between the two courses. 201 now explores academic areas, experiences that can be carried forward, a more intentional linkage
     - Struggle with the predictable of faculty who teach the courses each semester, typically four faculty candidates to teach 201, hope they’re available at the right time
     - Changing the major to 48 credits would also be challenging for those students needing a more formative experience, nice to have the opportunity to take additional courses to develop a greater depth; only 9 unique credits but curriculum is still tight
   - Question – Students struggle with writing their proposals, more help and time spent with them individually
     - Due to the unique concentrations chosen by students, breadth is quite great
   - Question – What are your top three recommendations that you’d like the committee to advocate for you?
     - #1 – “Strengthen connections between LS 201 and LS 301”
     - #2 – “Distribute the LS teaching and advising over a larger population of faculty” – faculty from English or Watershed have been only participants
     - #3 – “Increase FTE assignment to LS” – every department’s dream, hard to teach as part of load, class size increased from 20 to 30, hard to recruit faculty, departments need SCH
       - Harder to get to know the students, advisor needs to have a strong relationship with students
       - Preferable to keep enrollment lower due to unique type of proposals being submitted, loss of the cohort-feel you get in smaller class
     - Concur with idea of long-term director, a lot of fellow students have positive feedback that Jones has done a great job as interim
Feel the proposal process wasn’t explained very clearly, would like to know members of reviewing committee, their timeline, what type of feedback they’ll provide. Would be helpful to have a document stating the process, setting some expectations, less stress for students.

One of recommendations was to increase outreach so more students are aware of the program. Thinking part of issue may be that faculty don’t have significant knowledge and could benefit from some additional information too, the opportunities available. Greater outreach to faculty may be beneficial.

Question – Uncomfortable about the image people may be receiving about the students majoring in LS, not a positive image of what the liberal studies program is. What is steering committee doing to market the program positively?

- OMA has used liberal studies to help students of color create majors not offered, e.g., African American Studies, Hmong Studies. It helps to replace a degree we should have, fills a hole in the curriculum
- Serves several cohorts of students, e.g., students who applied for nursing or education, students who have accumulated credits and have changed their mind, both routes should be marketed
- LS’ Web site is being redone in July, could put some program samples/scenarios online, things that have been done in the past, student success stores, vocational outcomes (follow-up with students who have graduated)

Question – How is the transition to a different coordinator handled, what is the duration and process?

- Jones agreed to continue to work with the LS program until a new version of the coordinator is be determined, cuts to the College are a factor, could be a co-leadership type of position in the future. He won’t be continuing as coordinator but will help during the transition, someone has to be available for students
- The coordinator is a .4 position and typically appointed by Dean. Steering Committee is not involved.
- Curriculum has been set for 2016-2017.

Question – Is there a way to effectively collaborate with other professors? If a student takes a course as part of their degree, professors aren’t aware they’re a LS major. Professor could talk more meaningfully if aware.

- Another form? Would like to meet with students face-to-face, talk to them with how the course fits
- It’s perhaps an advising issue? Students should take that step to inform professor, perhaps via email
- Introductions are typically done at the start of the year, students state their major

One of Jones’ goals is to integrate the Steering Committee more with the assessment process. Need to revise the assessment plan, curriculum has been revised. Assessment data has been collected and has been helpful in revising curriculum

Fellow students questioned the purpose of LS 301

Would like capstone presentations advertised to faculty and administration, would allow others can see the breadth of the program, engage them in the process

APC will create a memo to be sent to Jones to clarify points and check for accuracy. It will then be sent to AVC Carney.

4. Establish Minor: Neuroscience, Liberal Arts

- Jewett was in attendance to provide information and answer questions
- Interdisciplinary minor - Biology and Psychology

Question – Will Psychology faculty be strongly encouraged to write external grants?

- Yes, only 7-10% of funds are granted, super competitive; there are other avenues where funding rates are better though

Question – Proposals states 24 required credits; however, it’s it 28 due to the CHEM 103 pre-req?

- Yes, will be clearly communicated in catalog and advisors will need to be upfront with informing students, labs are not required for the biology courses

Question – Which majors do you think this will this appeal to?

- Biology, students in the natural sciences of Psychology, pre-health

Question – Who will maintain/replace the mentioned lab equipment?

- Biology has been supportive in past, labs housed in Phillips, Biology does have a lab manager but unsure if they will be part of this, funds are available for lab mods

Motion was made to establish a Neuroscience, Liberal Arts minor within the Departments of Biology. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by a vote of 8 in favor and 0 against.
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5. Upcoming agenda items
   - Due to lack of time, Changes to the FASRP Action Table will be discussed on April 5th along with Sociology program review, grad program in English, approval of Computer Science memo

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

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Forcier
Secretary for the Meeting