ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

DATE:　　March 18, 2004

PRESENT:　Lorrie Steerey　　　　　　　　Sandie Rietz
　　　　　　　Paul Bauer　　　　　　　　　　Audrey ConnerRosberg
　　　　　　　Keith Edgerton　　　　　　　　Alan Davis
　　　　　　　Mark Hardt　　　　　　　　　　Connie Landis
　　　　　　　Matt Redinger
　　　　　　　Tasneem Khaleel (ex-officio)　　Janie Park (ex-officio)
　　　　　　　Carl Hanson (ex-officio)

ABSENT:　　St. John Robinson
　　　　　　　Mary Susan Fishbaugh – *excused*　　Randall Gloege – *excused*
　　　　　　　John Cech (ex-officio)　　　　　Joe Michels (ex-officio)
　　　　　　　Randy Rhine (ex-officio)　　　　George White (ex-officio)
　　　　　　　Terrie Iverson (ex-officio)　　　Amanda Mears (ex-officio)
　　　　　　　Victor Sargent (ex-officio)　　　Curt Kochner (ex-officio)

GUESTS:　　Tim Urbaniak　　　　　　　　Lonnie Schrag
　　　　　　　Michael Dennis　　　　　　　　Deb Schaffer
　　　　　　　David Butler　　　　　　　　　Steve Coffman
　　　　　　　Brian Cast

PRESIDING: Keith Edgerton, Chair

Keith Edgerton called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. in the Lewis & Clark room of the SUB.

The minutes of March 4 were accepted as presented.

I.　　Appointment of Lorrie Steerey – Permanent Replacement for Doug Brown

⇒ Motion by Sandie Rietz, seconded by Mark Hardt to **appoint Lorrie Steerey** to fill out Doug Brown's term as the College of Business representative on the Senate.

⇒ Motion carried unanimously.

II.   ITEMS – FOR INFORMATION

Item 32.a MEDA 279 Externship. New course
Item 32.b MEDA 124 Medical Assisting Clinical Procedures I. Change prerequisites.

Item 34 HLTH 104 Introduction to Nursing Skills. New course.

Item 35 AAS in Practical Nursing. Modify an existing program – **REVISED.**
Item 35.a NURS 107 Nursing Fundamentals I Lab Clinical. Delete course.
Item 35.b NURS 106 Nursing Fundamentals I. Delete course.
Item 35.c NURS 206 Nursing Fundamentals. New course.

Item 36 AS Degree Program of Study in Fire Science. Modify an existing program – **REVISED.**
Item 36.a FIRE 210 Building Construction for Firefighters. Delete course.
Item 36.d FIRE 255 Cause and Origin. New course.

Item 37 AS Degree Program of Study in Networking Technology. New program of study.

Tim Urbaniak, Chair of the UCC, noted that there was ample discussion about AA/AS degrees, such as the self-designed option. It was also noted that the UCC carefully vetted these proposals before approving them.

⇒ Motion by Lorrie Steerey, seconded by Sandie Rietz to **accept Items 32.a, 32.b, 34, 35, 35.a, 35.b, 35.c, 36, 36.a, 36.d, and 37 for information.**

⇒ Motion carried.

III.   DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEM

Discussion with Department Chairs/Team Leaders
Item 22 Revision of General Education Program – Proposal from the Gen Ed Committee REVISED.

It was noted that this proposal has been emailed to all faculty and department chairs.

Mark Hardt, Chair of the General Education Committee, noted that our accrediting body may have requested these changes, but we should make them because *we* want to. The Committee has made tremendous progress. The charge of the Committee was to focus

general education, but the Committee has also struggled to take the politics out of the situation. We have compromised, putting the students and the University as our priorities.

It was noted that according to this proposal, the slate will be wiped clean and courses will be resubmitted. What happens if only a few are submitted? It was noted that we will not put students into this program if there aren't enough classes for them to take.

It was noted that this structure will be gradually implemented so problems can be dealt with as they arise.

It was noted that General Education needs to be revised because most students don't see it as anything other than a money-maker for the University. Also, because the program is so unfocused, it is not assessable. Dr. Park, Provost, noted that NorthWest (our regional accrediting body) wants stated outcomes for the General Education Program as a whole, not for each individual course. We have to be able to show the students have met the program outcomes.

It was cited that usually proposing and accepting new general education courses is a long process. Mark Hardt noted that the General Education Committee will be coming up with operating principles to guide them on the submission of courses to avoid long, drawn out acceptance procedures. It was cited that the Committee could keep what we have now and just pull out the unacceptable courses. Michael Dennis, General Education Committee member, noted that the Committee observed the present system was inferior because it was put together for purely political reasons, and it is not assessable.

It was noted that the biggest problem in moving to a new structure is transitioning the students who started under the old and will finish under the new.

It was noted that faculty advisors can substitute courses at their discretion. The Academic Senate and the General Education Committee cannot change that.

It was noted that according to the proposal, the general education courses will be reviewed every year, and so some courses that were in can be "bumped" out of the program because of the limited number of offerings.

It was noted that students are expected to have some technological skills, and yet the University has almost no requirements for technology in General Education or Academic Foundations.

It was noted that this structure is based on outcomes. A smaller selection of courses will better fit the outcomes. We shouldn't think about lists of courses under headings, but rather courses that contribute to outcomes.

It was noted that the Committee has suggested a General Education Core of Faculty, similar to the Graduate Faculty, who would get together and talk about General Education/Academic Foundations and possibly how courses can be integrated. That core of faculty would also be more well-equipped to talk about and work with Academic Foundations. Dr. Park noted that some universities have FTE dedicated to general education which takes away the problem of departments losing FTE if they lose a general education course.

It was noted that the Global Academic Skills category does not mention oral communication or technology, both of which are important to all our students. Also, six credits in the Skills category do not allow for a math course, a writing course, a technology course, and whatever else the student might need. Dr. Park noted that ENGL 150 (College Composition) is a University-level course and cannot be pushed back to the Academic Support Center as a developmental course.

Sandie Rietz and Steve Coffman formally requested that the General Education Committee look into adding communication and technology to the existing categories of Academic Foundations.

It was cited by several General Education Committee members that presenting rationale about why courses should be in Academic Foundations is inappropriate at this time, because we are not to that step yet.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

rjrm