

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE
March 5, 2008**

The Academic Policies & Procedures Committee met on Wednesday, March 5, 2008 in the William C. Strickland Conference Room of I.G. Greer Hall to continue the discussion from the November 28, 2007 AP&P Committee meeting regarding the proposal for a new General Education governance structure and to consider another item of "Old Business" that was re-submitted from the College of Fine and Applied Arts (for the Department of Technology) for the March 5 agenda.

Committee members present: Dr. Jeff Butts (Chair), Dr. Jon Beebe, Mr. John Boyd, Dr. Dinesh Dave, Dr. Rodney Duke, Mr. Mark Malloy, Dr. Jon Saken, Dr. Kay Taylor, Mr. Joe Smith, Mr. Thomas Brigman (Parliamentarian), and Ms. Kendra Johnson.

Committee members excused: Dr. Allen Bryant, Dr. Ron Marden, Dr. Gayle Weitz, and Ms. Rachel Hicks.

At 3:05 p.m., Dr. Jeff Butts called the meeting to order.

MINUTES:

The November 7, 2007 AP&P Committee Minutes were approved as distributed.

VOTE 1 **YES** 10 **NO** 0 **ABSTAIN** 0

The November 28, 2007 AP&P Committee Minutes were approved as distributed.

VOTE 2 **YES** 10 **NO** 0 **ABSTAIN** 0

The January 16, 2008 AP&P Committee Minutes were approved as distributed.

VOTE 3 **YES** 10 **NO** 0 **ABSTAIN** 0

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Dr. Butts noted that there were no announcements for today's meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

Dr. Butts gave an overview of the status of General Education Proposal #3. When it was originally presented at the October 3, 2007 AP&P Committee meeting, this committee made some amendments to the original proposal (added more student representation, removed then re-added a library representative). Due to concern over faculty governance of the curriculum, a subcommittee was formed and the proposal was remanded to the subcommittee to make a recommendation. At the February 6, 2008 AP&P Committee meeting, the subcommittee presented their proposal to the full

committee. Since then, committee members should have received comments from Dr. Lynn Moss Sanders and a recent email from Dr. Rodney Duke.

Dr. Butts opened the floor for formal consideration of the subcommittee report. He reminded the committee that the report is amendable under the normal procedures of the committee. He explained that if the subcommittee report, with any amendments, passes, it would be sent to the Provost for review and approval. If the report fails, the original General Education Proposal 3, as amended, would be back on the table.

Dr. Butts noted that an email was sent to the University community inviting interested individuals to the meeting to address the committee.

Dr. Eric Marland, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, presented two concerns about the subcommittee report. His first concern was regarding faculty governance at the departmental level and who would be able to propose changes to the curriculum. Departments and colleges have the responsibility of determining staffing needs and allocating time and money, so any curricular changes should continue to pass through the departmental level, even if they are initiated by faculty. His second concern was the method of selection of members of the faculty oversight committees. Traditionally, committees have been populated by the Faculty Senate, and Dr. Marland thinks the appointments to these oversight committees should be done by Faculty Senate, even if the members are nominated by someone else. This would allow the process to remain consistent across all university committees.

Dr. Kay Taylor, Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee to Review Gen Ed Proposal #3, spoke about the subcommittee report. Committee members should have received an executive summary of the subcommittee report prior to this meeting. She said that the main question about the subcommittee report seemed to be "Why did the subcommittee want to establish the Curriculum Committee?". The original idea behind the Curriculum Committee was to receive more faculty input to guide curriculum matters. The original General Education Proposal #3 called for members of the faculty committees to be appointed by the General Education Council. The subcommittee felt that members of these committees should be appointed by Faculty Senate. Originally the subcommittee members said that voting members of the General Education Curriculum Committee should be faculty members, with appropriate administrators serving in a non-voting ex officio capacity. As their work progressed, the subcommittee members began to understand the need for cooperation with administrators and are now willing to allow certain administrators to be voting members. With this change, the major difference between the subcommittee report and the original General Education Proposal #3 is that the members of the faculty committees will be appointed by Faculty Senate instead of the General Education Council.

A new question which was raised is what makes a person a faculty member as opposed to an administrator.

A quick summary of the subcommittee report is that it would add another layer of approval (the General Education Curriculum Committee), committee members would be elected by other faculty members via the Faculty Senate, and that working with the General Education administrators is

recognized as being necessary. The subcommittee felt that the easiest solution may be to amend the original General Education Proposal #3 to have Faculty Senate make the appointments to faculty committees.

Dr. Butts noted that the language in the subcommittee report regarding who can make a proposal for curricular change is the same as the language used for AP&P.

Dr. Haney noted that the subcommittee report, while allowing some administrators to vote, still has the Director of General Education listed as a non-voting ex officio member. Dr. Taylor explained that the subcommittee was split, two in favor and two opposed, regarding allowing the Director to vote.

Dr. Rodney Duke stated that it seems like the committee is getting back on track as it works more with the General Education administration. He didn't feel that the original proposal was lacking faculty oversight. He said the committee needs to consider what will give the new General Education program the best start and add integrity to the curriculum. He didn't think we need another level of bureaucracy. He noted that there are committees on the campus which have members who don't understand the charge of the committee. He thought the more we shift back to the original proposal, the stronger the General Education program will be. He also wants a General Education administrator who knows General Education. He agrees with others that we need more student representation on the General Education Council than what was originally proposed.

Dr. Taylor noted that with elected faculty, there is the potential for greater variety. When starting the faculty committees, staggered terms will be necessary to ensure some continuity. For the first year, the 3-year appointees would be appointed by the General Education Council, and future appointments would be by the Faculty Senate.

Mr. Thomas Brigman felt that we are drifting away from the standard departmental governance of the curriculum. Currently, proposals go to a departmental oversight committee, the college curriculum oversight committee, the Graduate Council if necessary, the Core Curriculum Committee, and to AP&P. He said it seems like we are creating a structure that fits more into the AP&P structure than the departmental structure. He sees General Education as a department which is cross-disciplinary and cross-college. It seems as if we are looking too far in-depth. While he agrees that we need greater faculty oversight, he thinks the subcommittee report adds too much bureaucracy. He added that the Curriculum Committee should not be a committee of the Faculty Senate, but it should be run through the General Education program as if it were another department. He was disappointed that the committee wasted four months when it could have simply made minor alterations to the original proposal.

Dr. Eric Marland pointed out that members of the Faculty Senate would not be on the committees; they would approve the faculty members to serve on the committees.

Dr. Butts had some questions about the subcommittee report. On page 3, under "Areas of Responsibility" for each oversight committee, he was concerned about the wording "and delivery", which appears in the description for every committee. In his mind, "delivery" involves scheduling courses, selecting faculty, and determining how a course is taught, which seems unduly intrusive.

On page 7, #4 Propose developing a Gen Ed Curriculum Proposal Form, he asked if some compromise was possible there, so that General Education and AP&P could use the same form. On page 7, #5 Assessment of Gen Ed program, he asked if the periodic assessment of the program could be moved from the General Education Council to the Curriculum Committee. He thought the initial appointment plan was a nice compromise.

Dr. Taylor explained that the “and delivery” is language picked up from the *Faculty Handbook*. The intent of the Curriculum Committee is not to be so hands on.

Dr. Mike Mayfield also noted that the wording “guide development” is also problematic for the same reasons.

Dr. Taylor explained that the language used does not match the intent.

Mr. Mark Malloy said he understood “development and delivery” to refer to content rather than a hands on approach to the course. This is a situation where the *Handbook* is not clear. He said the committee should either make the intent clear or strike the phrase “and guide its development and delivery” from the description for each committee.

Mr. Brigman asked if the Faculty Senate approves appointments to departmental committees. Dr. Marland replied that Faculty Senate only approves appointments to university-wide committees.

Dr. Taylor said that the General Education Council should not be the final voice on curriculum matters. It seems like the General Education Council is getting in the way of curricular flow.

Dr. Butts asked for clarification that the Core Curriculum Committee will cease to exist when the new General Education program is implemented. Dr. Haney explained that the Core Curriculum Committee will need to continue as long as there are students working under the old Core.

Dr. Butts explained that the General Education Curriculum Committee would be in the same position as the Core Curriculum Committee in that new courses and changes to existing courses will still be presented to AP&P.

Dr. Jon Saken said he had been speaking to faculty in history, the fine arts, and the sciences and a concern consistently raised is that where a course fits into the new system is important. For example, there is worry that “things that are not history will be passed off as history.” There is concern about the mix of voting members on each committee. Admittedly, part of this is a turf battle, but part of it is also a pervasive concern over how “germane” is defined when judging the expertise of a faculty member regarding participation on a particular committee. If this issue is not addressed, the buy-in from faculty will be less.

Mr. Malloy said that if the two general education systems would be running concurrently, there needs to be communication between the two groups. We should try to avoid turf wars which might occur if courses have overlap with other departments. Any new form should include the perspective committees.

Dr. Duke said the reason for the creation of the Core Curriculum Committee was that there was no structure to maintain the integrity of the curriculum. That committee is composed of faculty members.

Dr. Saken expressed concern that the body that decides who sits on various committees will determine the curriculum. He said, "he who controls the process controls the outcome." He wanted to know how we can make sure that most of the faculty in a department agree with the selection of faculty making decisions regarding their area of expertise.

Mr. Don Rankins noted that if we went back to the original proposal and merged the Council and the Curriculum Committee into one oversight committee, it would be difficult for four faculty/administrator hybrids to override the other 20 members. Departments will continue to generate courses; the goal of the General Education Council is to generate interest.

Mr. John Boyd said he does not see the need for having both committees. If faculty governance is such a concern, amending the proposal to have Faculty Senate elect the faculty members will take care of that. He won't vote for an additional committee.

Dr. Haney explained the purpose of having faculty from different departments on each committee. For example, not all historians are in the History department.

Dr. Saken asked about the appeal process if, for example, the bulk of the History department disagrees with a course being granted Historical Studies status.

A motion was approved to end formal discussion and move to a formal vote, while leaving open the possibility of amendment to the subcommittee report.

VOTE 4 **YES** 10 **NO** 0 **ABSTAIN** 1

A motion failed to approve the report from the *Ad Hoc* Subcommittee to Review Gen Ed Proposal #3.

VOTE 5 **YES** 1 **NO** 10 **ABSTAIN** 0

With the failure to approve the subcommittee report, the original General Education Proposal #3, as amended, becomes the current item up for discussion. As amended, the General Education Council will be composed of 11 voting faculty members (chairs of the 4 Perspectives committees; chairs of the Fine Arts, Historical Studies, and Literary Studies committees; chairs of the Quantitative Literacy, Wellness, and Information and Communication Technology Literacy committees; and a representative from the Library); 3 voting students (2 representatives from SGA and 1 liaison from the Student General Education Advisory Board); and 8 non-voting ex officio administrators (Faculty Coordinator of General Education; Faculty Coordinator for the First Year Seminar; Director and Assistant Director of General Education; Coordinator of Writing Across the Curriculum; liaisons for assessment and advising; and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education).

Dr. Duke noted that, with the amendments, it seems like the committee is following the model of

the Core Curriculum Committee.

Dr. Butts noted that a possible amendment would be to use the Faculty Senate to populate the committees.

Dr. Saken asked for clarification on the difference between a council and a committee. Dr. Haney explained that a council is appointed by an administrator and reports to an administrator, while a committee must be appointed by the Faculty Senate. The General Education program is seeking to call this body a council because it would be too complicated to have a new chair every year.

Dr. Taylor suggested that clarifying language be added that when staggering the terms on the committees, the first 3-year term will be appointed by the General Education Council.

A motion was approved to amend the Gen Ed Proposal #3 so that the General Education Council would make appointments for the first 3-year term.

VOTE 6 YES 11 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Mr. Malloy asked if items 1 and 8 under “Theme and/or Course Approval Process” were conflicting with each other. Dr. Butts clarified that item 1 refers to new courses and item 8 refers to existing courses. The addition of the word “existing” is a minor editorial change and does not require a vote.

Dr. Holly Hirst asked for a reminder on the appeal process for AP&P and Dr. Haney provided an explanation.

Dr. Beebe asked if Writing Across the Curriculum and the Senior Capstone need to be included as faculty committees.

Dr. Haney explained that the coordinator of Writing Across the Curriculum is included as a member of the General Education Council. WAC is a part of the General Education curriculum, but it is also bigger than General Education. The WAC office is a new office, related but not part of the General Education office.

Dr. Haney also explained that it was important to the General Education Task Force that the Faculty Coordinator of General Education be the chair of the General Education Council.

Dr. Saken asked for clarification that as a “council”, the General Education Council is not subject to oversight by the Faculty Senate. Dr. Haney explained that while there is no requirement for a council to be subject to Senate oversight, there is nothing to prevent the Council from having its members appointed by Faculty Senate.

Dr. Taylor explained that the original charge to the subcommittee was to determine: the status of the General Education Council; the appointment process for the faculty committees; the approval process for themes and courses; and the role of AP&P in the process.

A motion was made to amend the proposal to change the appointment process so that members would be appointed by the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Duke asked about the coordinators of the First Year Seminar and Writing Across the Curriculum and their place on faculty committees.

Dr. Haney explained that the list of committees listed on page 2 of the original proposal are all that we have to work with right now. There is no faculty committee for WAC or the Capstone.

A motion was approved to cut off debate on the amendment.

VOTE 7 YES 11 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

A motion was approved to amend General Education Proposal #3 so that paragraph 3 on page 2 of the proposal reads “Members of the faculty committees will be appointed by the Faculty Senate. Committee chairs (to coordinate meetings and serve on the next level committee) will be elected by the committee, with the exception of the First Year Seminar committee, whose chair will be the Faculty Coordinator of the First Year Seminar.”

VOTE 8 YES 10 NO 1 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Beebe asked if a capstone committee should be added to the list of committees.

Mr. Brigman moved to amend the proposal to add a Capstone committee with 3 members to the list of committees.

Dr. Tony Calamai, Chair of the Council of Chairs, explained that the capstone is a senior level course which is departmental.

Dr. Mayfield said that it would be inappropriate for an outside committee to determine the content of a capstone. The language of the General Education Task Force final report allows for each department to conceive and implement the capstone for its own majors.

Dr. Calamai said that having a committee would be too much General Education oversight.

A motion was approved to table discussion of the General Education proposal to allow for consideration of a proposal from the Department of Technology.

VOTE 9 YES 11 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Proposal TEC 500-FAA-2007-414 from the College of Fine and Applied Arts for the Department of Technology was approved as follows (EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2008):

[Note: At the February 6 AP&P Committee meeting, this proposal was returned to the department for further consultations with the appropriate departmental chairs. The following persons were consulted (and all responded positively) in the development of this proposal to add TEC 5149, Entrepreneurship in Technology and Science: Dr. Stella Anderson, Mr. Bryan Toney, Dr. Phil Witmer, Dr. James Wilkes, Dr. Steve Seagle, Dr. Jim Young, Dr. Tony Calamai, and Dr. Mark Ginn.]

1. Course additions:

TEC 5149. Entrepreneurship in Technology and Science (3).F.

This course focuses on theories and strategies that are necessary for successful entrepreneurial activity in the fields of technology and science. Using a diverse set of resources including outside speakers, targeted readings, videos, personal exploration, and discussion, students will define their own potential entrepreneurial paths. The final project involves the development of a complete business plan.

VOTE 10 YES 11 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

A motion was approved to remove the General Education proposal from the table to allow for further consideration.

VOTE 11 YES 11 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

The current motion is to create a capstone committee.

Mr. Brigman asked what we are looking for this committee to do.

Dr. Haney explained that this committee would require official approval of all capstone courses by the General Education Council.

A motion failed to approve the creation of a faculty committee for approval of all capstone courses.

VOTE 12 YES 1 NO 10 ABSTAIN 0

Mr. Brigman suggested a reduction in the number of students on the General Education Council to keep it in line with the representation on AP&P.

Dr. Saken suggested that the initial assessment of the General Education program take place after 3 years instead of 5 years.

A motion was approved to extend the meeting until 5:15 p.m.

VOTE 13 YES 7 NO 4 ABSTAIN 0

A motion was made to replace the last sentence on page 1 of General Education Proposal #3 with the language from item 5 on page 7 of the subcommittee report.

An amendment was made to that motion to also include the language from item 6 on page 7 of the subcommittee report.

A motion was approved to amend the current motion to include the language from item 6 on page 7 of the subcommittee report.

VOTE 14 YES 10 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

A motion was approved to amend General Education Proposal #3 to replace the last sentence on page 1 with the following language: "The General Education Council will be responsible

for assessing the General Education program, and overseeing a thorough programmatic review after the third year of implementation. Thereafter, the Council will oversee a thorough programmatic review every five years. The findings of such assessment shall be presented to AP&P, the Faculty Senate, and made available to the entire University community. The Director of General Education will provide an annual review of the General Education program in regards to offerings, enrollment, overall assessment of the year's progress, future goals, and potential obstacles. Such a review shall be presented to AP&P, the Faculty Senate, and made available to the entire University community."

VOTE 15 YES 10 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Saken asked what happens if this structure passes and it does not work.

Dr. Haney explained that the General Education program would have to propose a new system and send it to AP&P for approval.

A motion was approved to amend the language of item 7 on page 3 of General Education Proposal #3. A second sentence was added, reading "Decisions of the General Education Council may be appealed to the Academic Policies & Procedures Committee."

VOTE 16 YES 10 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Duke made a motion to amend the proposal to include the Faculty Coordinator of General Education, the Faculty Coordinator of the First Year Seminar, the Writing Across the Curriculum Coordinator, and the Director of General Education as voting ex officio members of the General Education Council

Dr. Saken asked if the committee could compromise by leaving the Director of General Education as a non-voting ex officio member.

Dr. Mayfield noted that Carter Hammett-McGarry, Director of General Education, has 25 years experience in areas relevant to general education and that it makes no sense to deny her a vote when students with no experience are allowed a vote.

A motion failed to amend the previous amendment by removing the Director of General Education as a voting ex officio member of the General Education Council.

VOTE 17 YES 4 NO 6 ABSTAIN 0

A motion was approved to call for a vote on the current amendment on the table.

VOTE 18 YES 7 NO 3 ABSTAIN 0

A motion was approved to amend General Education Proposal #3 to change the following members of the General Education Council from non-voting ex officio members to voting ex officio members: Faculty Coordinator of General Education, Faculty Coordinator of the First Year Seminar, Writing Across the Curriculum Coordinator, and Director of General Education.

VOTE 19 **YES** 7 **NO** 3 **ABSTAIN** 0

A motion was approved to extend the meeting until 5:35 p.m.

VOTE 20 **YES** 8 **NO** 2 **ABSTAIN** 0

A motion was approved to end all discussion on General Education Proposal #3 and call for a vote.

VOTE 21 **YES** 9 **NO** 1 **ABSTAIN** 0

A motion was approved to accept General Education Proposal #3, as amended.

VOTE 22 **YES** 8 **NO** 2 **ABSTAIN** 0

A motion was approved to adjourn at 5:30 p.m.

VOTE 23 **YES** 10 **NO** 0 **ABSTAIN** 0

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE

March 5, 2008

Vote Record

VOTE SYMBOLS	y (YES)					N (NO)					A (ABSTAIN)												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
<u>Committee Members</u>																							
Jon Beebe	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	N	y	y	y	N	N	y	y	y	y	N	N	y	y	N	y
John Boyd	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y
Allen Bryant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jeff Butts	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y
Dinesh Dave	-	-	-	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y
Rodney Duke	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y
Mark Malloy	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y
Ron Marden	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jon Saken	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	N	N	y	N	N	y
Kay Taylor	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y
Gayle Weitz	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Joe Smith	y	y	y	A	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	N	y	y	y	N	y	y	N	y	y	y
Thomas Brigman	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rachel Hicks	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kendra Johnson	y	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	N	y	y	y	y	y	N	N	y	y	y

The recommendations of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, at its March 5, 2008 meeting are approved.

Stanley R. Aeschleman

Stanley R. Aeschleman

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

4/07/08

Date
