

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE: February 26, 2004

PRESENT:	Sandie Rietz	Paul Bauer
	Audrey ConnerRosberg	Mary Susan Fishbaugh
	Keith Edgerton	Randall Gloege
	Alan Davis	Mark Hardt
	Connie Landis	Matt Redinger
	John Cech (ex-officio)	Randy Rhine (ex-officio)
	Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)	Janie Park (ex-officio)
	Amanda Mears (ex-officio)	Victor Sargent (ex-officio)
	Carl Hanson (ex-officio)	

ABSENT:	St. John Robinson	
	Lorrie Steerey – <i>excused</i>	
	Joe Michels (ex-officio)	George White (ex-officio)
	Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)	Curt Kochner (ex-officio)

GUEST: Michael Dennis

PRESIDING: Keith Edgerton, Chair

Keith Edgerton called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

The minutes of February 19 were accepted as presented.

It was noted that Items 35, 35.a, 35.b, and 35.c have been pulled from the agenda.

I. ITEMS – FOR INFORMATION

Item 33 METL 201 Layout. Change prerequisites.

Item 33.a METL 202 Metal Fabrication Theory. Change prerequisites.

Item 33.b METL 203 Gas Metal Arc Welding (MIG). Change Prerequisites.

Item 33.c METL 204 Metal Fabrication. Change prerequisites.

It was noted that these COT courses are second semester courses, and they do not have prerequisites. It is possible a student could fail the first semester and still take the second semester, so these changes add prerequisites for these courses.

⇒ Motion by Matt Redinger, seconded by Audrey ConnerRosberg to **accept Items 33, 33.a, 33.b, and 33.c.**

⇒ Motion carried.

II. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Item 22 Revision of General Education Program – Proposal from the Gen Ed Committee.

Mark Hardt, Chair, General Education Committee, stated that this proposal has not just been slapped together. There is a lot of work involved here. However, the Committee may not have thought of some things, and there are some problems that cannot be predicted.

It was noted that this proposal focuses on the negative aspects of the current program. It could be stated more positively, so as not to put people on the defensive immediately.

It was cited that not all students dislike the current Gen Ed program. It was noted, however, that a majority of students seem to not understand the reasons for Gen Ed. Hopefully, this new program will make that clearer.

It was noted that the opening letter could say the Committee saw the problems as a need for revision, and here are the results of what the Committee has done. The current letter sounds like it's begging for acceptance.

Goals of the Program

Michael Dennis, General Education Committee member, noted that the goal of this revision is to cause students to think of knowledge as something active: to make them think and reflect on what they have learned in a comprehensive way.

It was noted that the Committee wants courses that are specifically designed for General Education in order to keep the program focused.

It was cited that if this proposal is approved, some Senate bylaw changes will be in order, including a modification of the UCC bylaws and the change of the Gen Ed Committee name to the Academic Foundations Committee.

It was noted that the word “menu” should not be used for the new program. That is what we have now, not what we’re going to have.

Process

It was noted that the UCC will still review the courses for academic rigor. It is not the Committee's desire to take power from the UCC. The General Education Committee will then review them for inclusion into the Academic Foundations program.

It was noted that the General Education Committee can further revise the cover letter and proposal to remove the inflammatory language and make the plan more positive.

The Baccalaureate

This document explains for the students how General Education/Academic Foundations fits into their whole university experience. This section would go into the catalog.

Title

It was noted that in this proposal, two different titles are presented. The Committee should review this inconsistency.

Structure

It was noted that the references to Bloom's Taxonomy of Thinking would not be included in the catalog. This portion is only for faculty as an explanation of how the committee arrived at the results.

It was noted that Bloom's hierarchy implies that learning occurs in a certain order. Learning's various stages/parts can happen simultaneously. It was cited that although the matrix is based on Bloom's hierarchy, the matrix actually allows for much more simultaneous learning.

Double Counting

It was noted that until the departments are not funded by the number of heads in each class, double counting is almost necessary.

Mark Hardt noted that the Committee has not yet resolved the double counting issue. The Committee does not want to harm faculty or penalize students.

It was noted that students could get special dispensation to cover the Gen Ed/Academic Foundations category that is in their major. That way, students would not have to take extra credits because their major courses do not count in Academic Foundations.

It was cited however, that the Committee wants courses that are specifically for Academic Foundations, and so would not apply to a major, thus eliminating this problem. However, creating new courses takes time.

Janie Park, Provost, noted that currently we have a certain amount of money for General Education. If there were fewer courses but more sections of those courses, it would add up to the same amount of money. This would just mean a shift in funding.

Connie Landis, General Education Committee member, noted that the Committee wants to encourage tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach Academic Foundations.

It was noted that this new program gives many opportunities for integrated and team-taught courses.

It was noted that Academic Foundations would have in every category both traditional and integrated courses. Students who know they will need to transfer can take the non-integrated courses so they will have less difficulty. We don't want to create a situation where students have to stay here and finish our program, but transferring is always difficult.

It was noted that once the Committee decides on a double counting policy, it needs to be clearly articulated for the students in the catalog.

The Committee will revise this proposal and bring it back next week.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

rjrm