

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE
October 3, 2007

The Academic Policies & Procedures Committee met on Wednesday, October 3, 2007 in the William C. Strickland Conference Room of I.G. Greer Hall.

Committee members present: Dr. Jeff Butts (Chair), Dr. Jon Beebe, Mr. John Boyd, Dr. Allen Bryant, Dr. Rodney Duke, Mr. Mark Malloy, Dr. Ron Marden, Dr. Jon Saken, Dr. Kay Taylor, Dr. Gayle Weitz, Ms. Erin Boyer, Mr. Thomas Brigman (Parliamentarian), and Ms. Kendra Johnson. Committee members excused: Dr. Dinesh Dave and Ms. Lindsay Tigar.

Dr. Jeff Butts called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. He introduced the following new voting members of the AP&P Committee for the 2007-2008 academic year.

Faculty: Dr. Jon Saken (Department of Physics and Astronomy), Dr. Gayle Weitz (Department of Art), and Dr. Allen Bryant (Department of Curriculum and Instruction).

Graduate Student: Ms. Erin Boyer.

Undergraduate Students: Mr. Thomas Brigman, Ms. Kendra Johnson, and Ms. Lindsay Tigar (in absentia).

In addition to recognizing the new members, Dr. Butts also acknowledged his appreciation to Dr. Jon Beebe (Music), Mr. John Boyd (Library), and Dr. Ron Marden (Accounting) for agreeing to serve additional terms on the AP&P Committee. (Although he did not recognize himself, Dr. Butts has also agreed to serve an additional 3-year term on this committee.)

MINUTES:

The April 25, 2007 AP&P Committee Minutes were approved as distributed, with the following corrections:

1. (Page 8, number 4.) Correct the number of required hours from 57 s.h. to 72 s.h. in the following statement: “(The total number of hours required for the Master of Arts/Specialist in School Psychology, 72 s.h., did not change.)”
2. (Page 23, numbers 2. and 3.) Delete the statements “(see number 4. below)” in both of those paragraphs.

VOTE 1 YES 11 NO 0 ABSTAIN 2

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

The request to change the title of the **Master of Science degree in Applied Physics (206A/40.0801)** to a **Master of Science degree in Engineering Physics (CIP 40.0801)** with the following two concentrations: 1) Systems and Laboratory Automation, or 2) Professional Science Master’s in Instrumentation and Automation was approved by the UNC-General Administration, per letter dated 8/13/07. (See Page 21 of the April 25, 2007 AP&P Committee meeting minutes.) (**EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2007**)

2. REMINDER OF THE DEADLINE FOR BOTH CATALOGS: The February 6, 2008 AP&P Committee meeting will be the deadline for submitting proposals to the AP&P Committee for all undergraduate and graduate course and degree requirement changes that are to be included in the *2008-2009 Undergraduate Bulletin* and the *2008-2009 Graduate Bulletin*.

3. Listed below are the **SPECIAL DESIGNATOR** action(s) that received final approval from

the Core Curriculum Committee at their meeting on August 31, 2007. These items are presented at the AP&P Committee meeting FOR INFORMATION ONLY:

Add the **W (WRITING)** special designator to the following courses: (EFF. Fall, 2008)

AS 2510. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Humanities)/(3).F.On Demand.
AS 2515. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Social Sciences)/(3).S.On Demand.
AS 4510. Senior Honors Thesis/(3).F;S.
AS 4550. Senior Seminar/(3).F.
SD 3000. Science for Sustainability/(4).S.
SD 3800. Classics in Sustainable Development/(3).S.
SD 4570. Sustainable Development in the Modern World System/(3).F;S.
WS 4550. Senior Seminar/(3).S.
WS 4650. Feminist Theories/(3).On Demand.

Add the **S (SPEAKING)** special designator to the following courses: (EFF. Fall, 2008)

AS 4550. Senior Seminar/(3).F.
SD 3000. Science for Sustainability/(4).S.
SD 3800. Classics in Sustainable Development/(3).S.
WS 4550. Senior Seminar/(3).S.
WS 4650. Feminist Theories/(3).On Demand.

Add the **MC (MULTI-CULTURAL)** special designator to the following courses:
(EFF. Fall, 2008)

AS 2510. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Humanities)/(3).F.On Demand.
AS 2515. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Social Sciences)/(3).S.On Demand.
AS 4110. Ethnographic Field Study/(1-6).On Demand.
SD 4570. Sustainable Development in the Modern World System/(3).F;S.
WS 2400. Distinguished Lectures on Women, Sex, and Gender/(3).On Demand.
WS 2420. Sex, Gender, and Power: Introduction to Women's Studies for the Humanities/(3).S.
WS 2421. Sex, Gender, and Power: Introduction to Women's Studies for the Social Sciences/(3).F.
WS 3200. Global Women's Issues/(3).On Demand.
WS 3300. Gender and Technology/(3).On Demand.
WS 3400. Women, Food, and Nature/(3).On Demand.
WS 4650. Feminist Theories/(3).On Demand.

Add the **CD (CROSS-DISCIPLINARY)** special designator to the following courses:
(EFF. Fall, 2008 with one exception - CHE 2550 is effective Spring, 2008)

CHE 2550. Introduction to Environmental Chemistry/(3).F. (EFF. Spring, 2008)
AS 2510. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Humanities)/(3).F.On Demand.
AS 2515. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Social Sciences)/(3).S.On Demand.
AS 4550. Senior Seminar/(3).F.
SD 2400. Principles of Sustainable Development/(3).F;S.
SD 4570. Sustainable Development in the Modern World System/(3).F;S.
WS 2400. Distinguished Lectures on Women, Sex, and Gender/(3).On Demand.
WS 2420. Sex, Gender, and Power: Introduction to Women's Studies for the Humanities/(3).S.
WS 2421. Sex, Gender, and Power: Introduction to Women's Studies for the Social

Sciences/(3).F.

WS 3200. Global Women's Issues/(3).On Demand.

WS 3300. Gender and Technology/(3).On Demand.

WS 3400. Women, Food, and Nature/(3).On Demand.

WS 4550. Senior Seminar/(3).S.

WS 4650. Feminist Theories/(3).On Demand.

Add the **ND (NUMERICAL DATA)** special designator to the following course:

SD 3000. Science for Sustainability/(4).S. (EFF. Fall, 2008)

Add the **C (COMPUTER)** special designator to the following course:

WS 3300. Gender and Technology/(3).On Demand. (EFF. Fall, 2008)

ELECTION OF CHAIR:

Dr. Dave Haney presided over the next agenda item: the election of a Chair for the AP&P Committee. Dr. Haney noted that according to the *Faculty Handbook*, the guidelines for University Committees state that "Every committee will select a chair for the academic year at their first fall semester meeting." He then opened the floor for nominations for the position of Chair of the AP&P Committee. Mr. Mark Malloy nominated Dr. Jeff Butts, and Dr. Butts accepted the nomination. There being no further nominees, a motion was approved to close the nominations.

VOTE 2 **YES 12** **NO 0** **ABSTAIN 0**

Dr. Jeff Butts was elected by acclamation to serve as Chair of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee for the 2007-2008 academic year.

VOTE 3 **YES 12** **NO 0** **ABSTAIN 0**

SELECTION OF A PARLIAMENTARIAN:

Dr. Butts noted that the next item on the agenda was to select a Parliamentarian for the AP&P Committee. This committee is run by *Robert's Rules of Order*. Dr. Butts asked for volunteers who would be interested in serving as Parliamentarian. Mr. Thomas Brigman volunteered. Hearing no objections, Dr. Butts announced that Mr. Brigman will serve as the Parliamentarian for the AP&P Committee during the 2007-2008 academic year.

SUBCOMMITTEE FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES:

The next item on the agenda was to request volunteers to serve on the SUBCOMMITTEE FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES. For the benefit of the new committee members, Dr. Butts explained that the AP&P Committee approved a recommendation in February, 2006 to **"Appoint a subcommittee, or other body, from the AP&P membership that is responsible for an annual updating of the AP&P Manual (*Academic Governance Handbook*), particularly providing an ongoing review of the policies."**

Dr. Butts solicited volunteers to serve on that standing subcommittee for the 2007-2008 academic year. He noted, for example, that the Faculty Senate has asked the AP&P Committee to look at the guidelines for graduation with Latin honors. There will be other items added as the academic year progresses. The following members volunteered: Dr. Gayle Weitz, Dr. Kay Taylor, Dr. Jon Saken, and Mr. Don Rankins. Dr. Butts thanked the volunteers and he noted that he will appoint and charge that subcommittee before our next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

Dr. Nina-Jo Moore presented proposals from the College of Fine and Applied Arts for the Departments of Family and Consumer Sciences, and Technology.

Proposals FCS-FAA-2007-1 through FCS-FAA-2007-5 from the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences were approved as follows (**EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2008**):

1. Change the course description of **FCS 4900. Internship** to reflect 40 clock hours (field placement hours) required for each credit hour. The revised course description will read as follows:
FCS 4900. Internship (3-12).F;S.
Field experience or employment in the area of the student's interest: (a) apparel and textiles; (b) foods and nutrition; (c) child development; (d) family and consumer sciences education. Supervision and evaluation by the employer and the faculty member.
Prerequisites:
 - A. 2.00 overall grade-point average
 - B. College rank: juniors (60 s.h.)
 - C. Completed 35 semester hours of family and consumer sciences courses including FCS 4400 (except 24 semester hours for family and consumer sciences education majors)
 - D. Internship proposal fully approved
 - E. Major courses completed:
 1. Apparel and Textiles: FCS 1000, FCS 1001, FCS 2000, FCS 3003; ECO 2030; MKT 3050; ACC 1100
 2. Child Development: FCS 2101, FCS 2103, FCS 2104, FCS 2201, FCS 3101, FCS 3106; SPE 3100
 3. Family and Consumer Sciences Education: 24 semester hours in family and consumer sciences completed
 4. Foods and Nutrition: FCS 1202, FCS 2202, FCS 2203, FCS 2204, FCS 3202, FCS 3205, FCS 4504

Graded on an S/U basis. Hours requirement for three credit hours is 120 hours with 40 hours required for each additional credit.
2. Revise the course requirements for the **Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development (510*/19.0706) with concentrations in Family and Consumer Sciences (510F) and Psychology (510D)** by increasing the major requirements from 60 to 64 s.h. and decreasing the number of free electives from 20 to 16 s.h. to reflect the change in the FCS 4900 Internship from 6 to 10 s.h. (The total number of hours required for this degree, 122 s.h., did not change.) The revised catalog description will read as follows:

Child Development (Non-teaching)

The Departments of Family and Consumer Sciences and Psychology cooperate to offer the B.S. degree in Child Development (non-teaching) with concentrations in Family and Consumer Sciences, and in Psychology conferred by the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences.

The Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development (510*/19.0706) with a concentration in Family and Consumer Sciences (510F) is designed to give the student a broad base of knowledge about children and families. Majors will take courses in all areas of family and consumer sciences. Because of the broad base of courses and the number of electives including a variety of course opportunities across the university, advisors are able to help students prepare for exciting careers working with children and families. **The Bachelor of Science degree in Child Development (510*/19.0706) with a concentration in Psychology (510D)** was designed to emphasize preparation

for graduate study in the area of child psychology. A strong emphasis is placed on research skills including statistics. Students enrolling in this concentration will need a strong background in math.

The Family and Consumer Sciences concentration (510F) includes a 14 semester hour core: FCS 2201, FCS 3101, FCS 3106, and FCS 4610; SPE 3100; and 47 minimum semester hours of family and consumer sciences major requirements: FCS 1202, FCS 1300, FCS 1400, FCS 2101, FCS 2102, FCS 2103, FCS 2104, FCS 2202 (counted in core curriculum hours), FCS 2600, FCS 3102, FCS 4102, FCS 4400, FCS 4450, FCS 4551, and FCS 4900 (10 min. s.h.) and HED 3100/HP 3100.

In addition, the following core curriculum courses are required: PSY 1200; BIO 1101 and BIO 1102; HIS 1101 and HIS 1102; and SOC 1000. Also, two semester hours minimum of free electives outside the major discipline are required.

The Psychology concentration (510D) includes a 20 semester hour core: FCS 2201, FCS 3101, FCS 3102, FCS 3106, FCS 4102, FCS 4610; PSY 4202; a 31 semester hour psychology block which includes PSY 1200, PSY 2301, PSY 3100; FCS 2103; STT 2810 ("C" minimum); 9 s.h. from PSY 2400, PSY 2402, PSY 3202, PSY 4658; 6 s.h. from PSY 3000, PSY 3205, PSY 4660, PSY 4700; and 16 semester hours which include CI 2800/SPE 2800; RE 3142/CI 3142; SOC 4800; ART 3021; and FCS 2102.

In addition, the following core courses are required: BIO 1101 and BIO 1102; MAT 1010; SOC 1000; and PSY 1200. Also, two semester hours minimum of free electives outside the major discipline are required.

Students majoring in Child Development with a concentration in Psychology or Family and Consumer Sciences must have an overall 2.0 GPA in the major.

3. Revise the course requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Apparel and Textiles (500A/19.0901) by increasing the major requirements from 62 to 66 s.h. and decreasing the number of free electives from 7 to 3 s.h. to reflect the change in the FCS 4900 Internship from 6 to 10 s.h. (The total number of hours required for this degree, 128 s.h., did not change.) The revised catalog description will read as follows:

The Bachelor of Science degree in Apparel and Textiles (500A/19.0901) consists of 57 semester hours in family and consumer sciences: FCS 1000, FCS 1001, FCS 1400, FCS 2000, FCS 2002, FCS 2011, FCS 2050, FCS 2103, FCS 3002, FCS 3003, FCS 3010, FCS 4000, FCS 4002, FCS 4003, FCS 4004, FCS 4060, FCS 4400, FCS 4450, and FCS 4900 (10 s.h.); and 9 semester hours in the following related areas: ART 1001 or ART 1011, and ART 2008; COM 2101. The student should also complete ECO 2030 and PSY 1200 as part of the core curriculum to meet departmental requirements. A minor in marketing (18 s.h.) is required. An overall 2.0 is required in the minor. Also, two semester hours minimum of free electives outside the major discipline are required.

4. Revise the course requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Foods and Nutrition (520*/19.0501) with a concentration in Foods and Nutrition, General (520C) by increasing the major requirements from 78 to 82 s.h. and decreasing the number of free electives from 5 to 2 s.h. to reflect the change in the FCS 4900 Internship from 6 to 10 s.h. (The total number of hours required for this degree increased from 122 to 123 s.h.) The revised catalog description will read as follows:

The Bachelor of Science degree in Foods and Nutrition (520*/19.0501) with a concentration in Foods and Nutrition, General (520C) consists of 57 semester hours in family and consumer sciences: FCS 1202, FCS 1400, FCS 2103, FCS 2202, FCS 2203, FCS 2204, FCS 3202, FCS 3205, FCS 4200, FCS 4206, FCS 4240, FCS 4250, FCS 4400, FCS 4450, FCS 4504, FCS 4552, FCS

4560, FCS 4701, FCS 4900 (10 s.h.); 25 semester hours in the following related courses: ACC 1100; BIO 1110, BIO 3308; CHE 2101 and CHE 2203, or CHE 2201 and CHE 2203; ES 2000; HP 3200 and HP 4100.

In addition, the following core curriculum courses are required: CHE 1101, CHE 1110 and CHE 1102, CHE 1120; and PSY 1200. No minor required. Also, two semester hours of free electives outside the major discipline are required.

5. Revise the course requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in Foods and Nutrition (520*/19.0501) with a concentration in Foodsystems Management (520B) by increasing the major requirements from 58-60 to 62 s.h. and decreasing the number of free electives from 5-7 to 3 s.h. to reflect the change in the FCS 4900 Internship from 6 to 10 s.h. (The total number of hours required for this degree, 122 s.h., did not change) The revised catalog description will read as follows:

The Bachelor of Science degree in Foods and Nutrition (520*/19.0501) with a concentration in Foodsystems Management (520B) consists of 41 semester hours in family and consumer sciences: FCS 1202, FCS 1400, FCS 2103, FCS 2202, FCS 2203, FCS 2204, FCS 3202, FCS 3210, FCS 4400, FCS 4450, FCS 4504, FCS 4550, FCS 4900 (10 s.h.); 21 semester hours of other related courses: CHE 3530-3549 (Selected Topics: Appreciating and Understanding Wine); COM 2101; ENG 3100 or ENG 3700; HP 3100 or HED 3100; HP 3130; and two of the following three courses: HOS 4050, LAW 2150, MGT 3060. A minor in general business is required and must include: ACC 1100; CIS 3050; ECO 2030; MGT 3010; MKT 3050; FIN 3010 or FIN 3680 (with permission of the instructor).

In addition, the following core curriculum courses are required: GSA 1010 or GSP 1010, GSC 1020, GSG 1030, GSB 1040; PSY 1200; and ECO 2030. Also, two semester hours of free electives outside the major discipline are required.

VOTE 4 YES 13 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

[NOTE: Proposals TEC-FAA-2007-1, 2, 7, 9, 10 and 11 from the Department of Technology were withdrawn from consideration at today's meeting. Members were asked to recycle those copies. They will be revised and resubmitted for consideration at a later date.]

Proposal TEC-FAA-2007-8 from the Department of Technology was approved as follows:
(EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2008)

1. Add **CORE: SOCIAL SCIENCES** credit to TEC 3601. Introduction to Energy Issues and Technology (as approved by the Core Curriculum Committee on 8/31/07). The course description will read as follows:
TEC 3601. Introduction to Energy Issues and Technology (3).F;S.
This course will explore the various forms of energy and will examine the complete range of energy alternatives existing in the world today. Students will examine energy resources and the economic and environmental impacts. Students will also have the opportunity to learn about the concepts, tools, techniques and materials needed to design and construct systems that are used to produce energy. A major focus of the course will be on the renewable or sustainable forms of energy. Students will study how to measure these renewable resources and estimate the power that could be produced from them, as well as the technological options that exist for transforming these resources into useful sources of energy. Lecture

three hours. (CROSS-DISCIPLINARY) (CORE: SOCIAL SCIENCES)

VOTE 5 YES 13 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Rainer Goetz presented proposals from the College of Arts and Sciences for the Department of History; and proposals from Appalachian Studies, and Global Studies.

[NOTE: Dr. Goetz asked the committee members to keep the copies of the proposals from the Department of Biology that were distributed for today's meeting and please bring them back to the November 7 AP&P Committee meeting. He explained that those proposals did not make it to the Graduate Council in time for their September meeting. They will be considered for approval at the October Graduate Council meeting.]

Proposal HIS 8 from the Department of History was approved as follows:
(EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2008)

1. Revise the course requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree in History, Secondary Education (247A/13.1328)[T] (with teacher licensure) by adding HIS 4000 to the list of required courses and by updating the 56 semester hours of major requirements. (The total number of hours required for this degree, 122 s.h., did not change.) The revised catalog description will read as follows:

The Bachelor of Science degree in History, Secondary Education (247A/13.1328)[T] (with teacher licensure) consists of 36 semester hours in history beyond the core curriculum history requirement. Majors must take HIS 2201, HIS 2204, plus six semester hours in European history, six semester hours in Non-Western history (Latin America, Asia, Africa), HIS 4000 (Senior Colloquium), HIS 4100 (Senior Seminar, "C" minimum required), and an additional 12 semester hours of history. One 3 s.h. 2000-level course must be taken before any 3000-level course may be taken, and one 3000-level course must be taken before any 4000-level course may be taken. No more than 12 semester hours may be taken at the 2000-level. This degree also requires 15 semester hours in related social studies disciplines, plus the professional education course requirements, including CI 3100 and RE 4630. Licensure is in both history and social studies. For the requirements in teacher education, refer to the Department of Curriculum & Instruction in this catalog.

VOTE 6 YES 13 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Proposals AS 07-4 and AS 07-5 from the Center for Appalachian Studies were approved as follows:
(EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2008)

1. Add **CORE: HUMANITIES** credit to AS 2510. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Humanities) (as approved by the Core Curriculum Committee on 8/31/07). The course description will read as follows:
AS 2510. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Humanities) (3).F.On Demand. Seminar on a selected topic or topics in Appalachian Studies, encouraging independent scholarship through reading, writing and discussion. Enrollment is by invitation or application. Content will vary. (WRITING; MULTI-CULTURAL; CROSS-DISCIPLINARY) (CORE: HUMANITIES)

2. Add **CORE: SOCIAL SCIENCES** credit to AS 2515. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Social Sciences) (as approved by the Core Curriculum Committee on 8/31/07). The course description will read as follows:
AS 2515. Sophomore Honors Colloquium (Social Sciences) (3).S.On Demand.
Seminar on a selected topic or topics in Appalachian Studies, encouraging independent scholarship through reading, writing and discussion. Enrollment is by invitation or application. Content will vary. (WRITING; MULTI-CULTURAL; CROSS-DISCIPLINARY) (CORE: SOCIAL SCIENCES)

VOTE 7 YES 13 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Proposals GLS 1-5 and GLS 7-9 from Global Studies were approved as amended as follows:
(EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2008, *contingent upon the approval of the proposed Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies from the UNC General Administration.*)

1. Add a new course prefix, **GLS (Global Studies)** for the Global Studies program within the University College.
2. Course additions:
[Note: GLS 2000 was approved for the **MC (MULTI-CULTURAL)** and **CD (CROSS-DISCIPLINARY)** special designators at the 9/28/07 Core Curriculum Committee meeting.]
GLS 2000. Contemporary Global Issues (3).F;S.
This course examines a selection of global issues from a variety of perspectives and disciplines. Students will be exposed to the complexities of these issues, which are the result of the confluence of historical, geographical, economic, cultural, and political factors. Emphasis will be placed on how different societies view global issues, as well as how different perspectives can alter one's understanding of them. (MULTI-CULTURAL; CROSS-DISCIPLINARY)

GLS 2500. Independent Study (1-4).On Demand.

GLS 2530-2549. Selected Topics (1-4).On Demand.

An opportunity to study a special topic or a combination of topics not otherwise provided for in the Global Studies curriculum. May be repeated for credit when content does not duplicate.

GLS 3500. Independent Study (1-4).On Demand.

GLS 3520. Instructional Assistance (1).On Demand.

A supervised experience in the instructional process on the university level through direct participation in a classroom situation. Graded on an S/U basis. Prerequisite: junior or senior standing. May be repeated for a total credit of three semester hours.

GLS 3530-3549. Selected Topics (1-4).On Demand.

An opportunity to study a special topic or a combination of topics not otherwise provided for in the Global Studies curriculum. May be repeated for credit when content does not duplicate.

[Note: GLS 4000 was approved for the **W (WRITING), S (SPEAKING), and MC (MULTI-CULTURAL)** special designators at the 9/28/07 Core Curriculum Committee meeting.]

GLS 4000. Seminar in Global Studies (3).F;S.

Students will engage in an intensive investigation of one or more global questions, themes, or issues in global studies. The class is organized as a seminar. Emphasis is placed on critical reading, research, writing, and speaking. The topic of this course will vary from semester to semester. Barring duplication of content, a student may repeat the course. The communication proficiency in Global Studies is met by earning a grade of "C" or higher in this course. (WRITING; SPEAKING; MULTI-CULTURAL)

GLS 4510. Thesis/Project (3).On Demand.

Students must complete a major project that makes use of and integrates the material from the Global Studies core in relation to a significant issue in Global Studies. Students may either write a thesis or conduct a project, which will be supervised by a member of the Global Studies faculty and read by another Appalachian State University faculty member in a field appropriate to the topic selected by the student. Prerequisite: student must get approval from an advisor in the Global Studies program prior to enrolling.

GLS 4530-4549. Selected Topics (1-4).On Demand.

An opportunity to study a special topic or a combination of topics not otherwise provided for in the Global Studies curriculum. May be repeated for credit when content does not duplicate.

GLS 4900. Internship (1-9).On Demand.

Supervised work in an appropriate field experience. A critical means to apply theoretical constructs, methods and techniques learned in the classroom to real-world settings. The internship offers ways of acquiring practical work experience with community organizations, non-governmental organizations, governmental organizations, and businesses that work on global issues, both domestically and internationally. Internships may occur at the local, regional, state, national or international levels, but must be relevant to global studies. Prerequisite: student must get approval from an advisor in the Global Studies program prior to enrolling. Graded on an S/U basis.

3. Add a **Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies (CIP Code xx.xxxx)**. [CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL FROM THE UNC GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.] (The total number of hours required for the new Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies will be 122 s.h.) The proposed catalog description will read as follows:

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies (xxxA/xx.xxxx)

The general features of the Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies are: (1) a series of core courses which give all GLS majors a firm grounding in Global Studies theory, perspectives and methods; (2) a coherent group of courses in one focus area; (3) a substantial foreign language requirement; (4) a study abroad requirement; and (5) a capstone experience which integrates components of the student's program of study.

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies requires a minimum of 122 semester hours for the degree. A minor is required. In addition to the core curriculum, the foreign language requirement, and the major and minor requirements, electives must be taken to meet the total required minimum hours. Two semester hours of free electives OUTSIDE the major discipline are also required. A candidate for the Bachelor of Arts degree may count NOT more than a total of 40 semester hours

above the core curriculum requirements in Global Studies.

Students must complete 36 semester hours of major requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies as follows:

1. **Required Core (12 semester hours)**

- a. GLS 2000, Contemporary Global Issues (3 s.h.)
GLS 4000, Seminar in Global Studies (3 s.h.)
- b. Select one of the following social science courses:
ANT 1215, Cultural Anthropology (3 s.h.)
GHY 1020, World Regional Geography (3 s.h.)
PS 2240, Comparative Politics (3 s.h.)
- c. Select one of the following humanities/arts courses:
ART 2130, Renaissance Through Contemporary Art (3 s.h.)
ENG 2040, World Literature (3 s.h.)
REL 1110, Religions of the World (3 s.h.)
MUS 2018, Introduction to World Music (3 s.h.)

2. **Focus Area (24 semester hours)**

The focus area is made up of courses drawn from two or more disciplines, departments or programs, with a single coherent emphasis, such as: German Studies; Francophone Studies; Latin American Studies; African Studies; Development and Globalization; Peace, Conflict, and Human Rights; or Judaic and Holocaust Studies. For other potential focus areas, consult the Director of the Global Studies program. Students may create their own focus area if the University offers courses sufficient to support it. The focus area requires careful planning, and students are encouraged to develop their programs of study early in their academic careers in consultation with their advisor, who must approve all courses for this requirement. At least 15 semester hours of this requirement must be at the 3000 level or above. Credit hours from study abroad or from an international internship may be used in the student's focus area, as appropriate. Courses counted towards the Global Studies core requirements may not be counted in the focus area. Copies of each student's program of study must be approved by the Global Studies Director, as well as the advisor, and will be placed on file in the University College office.

Other requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies include:

- **Foreign Language** - Students are required to complete 15 semester hours of a foreign language at the 2000 level or higher. Some or all of these hours may count towards the major focus area (see 2. above) with permission of the advisor and the Global Studies Director, or towards the minor.
- **Study Abroad** - Global Studies majors are strongly encouraged to study abroad for one year, but are required to complete a minimum of twelve consecutive weeks in a study abroad program or an international internship relevant to their program of study and approved prior to departure by the student's advisor and the Global Studies Director. This requirement may be waived by petition for those able to demonstrate a similarly significant, structured international education experience. Students for whom study abroad would pose a significant financial or personal hardship are urged to consult with the Global Studies Director for possible alternatives. Study abroad courses or internship hours may be counted towards the major requirements, the foreign language requirements, and/or the minor, as appropriate, upon approval by the Global Studies Director.
- **Capstone Experience** - Each student must give a presentation which integrates two or more aspects of the course of study (core, focus area, foreign language, and/or study abroad) to Global Studies faculty and other students, within one semester prior to graduation. Satisfactory completion of this presentation is determined by the advisor and director, and is required for the degree.
- **Minor** - Students are strongly urged, whenever possible, to minor in a foreign language, which will satisfy the foreign languages requirement (as noted above). A student with a

Global Studies major may not minor in Global Studies. Only six semester hours of the major may be counted towards the minor and vice versa.

Additional information and requirements for the Bachelor of Arts degree in Global Studies are included on the degree checksheet, which is available upon request from the Academic Advising Center or from the Director of the Global Studies Program.

3. Add an undergraduate minor in Global Studies (CIP xx.xxxx). (The total number of hours required for the minor in Global Studies will be 18 s.h.) The proposed catalog description will read as follows:

Minor in Global Studies (xxx/xx.xxxx)

A student may earn an undergraduate minor in Global Studies by successful completion of an interdisciplinary program of 18 semester hours as follows:

1. **Required (3 semester hours)**

Students must select one of the following:

GLS 2000, Contemporary Global Issues (3 s.h.)

GLS 4000, Seminar in Global Studies (3 s.h.)

OR, a GLS Selected Topics course (3 s.h.) (upon approval by the advisor)

2. **Focus Area (15 semester hours)**

The focus area is made up of courses drawn from two or more disciplines, departments or programs, with a single coherent emphasis, such as: German Studies; Francophone Studies; Latin American Studies; African Studies; Development and Globalization; Peace, Conflict, and Human Rights; or Judaic and Holocaust Studies. For other potential focus areas, consult the Director of the Global Studies program. Students may create their own focus area if the University offers courses sufficient to support it. The focus area requires careful planning, and students are encouraged to develop their programs of study early in their academic careers in consultation with their advisor, who must approve all courses for this requirement. Only six semester hours of the major may be counted towards the minor in Global Studies, and at least 9 semester hours of the focus area must be at the 3000 level or above. Credit hours from study abroad or from an international internship may be used in the student's focus area, as appropriate. A student with a Global Studies major may not minor in Global Studies. Copies of each student's program of study must be approved by the Global Studies Director, as well as the advisor, and will be placed on file in the University College office.

VOTE 8 YES 13 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Heather Hulburt presented two proposals from the Walker College of Business and two proposals from the Department of Computer Information Systems.

Proposals COB 2.0607 and COB 3.0607 from the Walker College of Business were approved as follows (EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2008):

1. Change the requirements to be admitted to the College of Business by deleting the requirement that students must "Pass a College of Business basic Writing Skills Test." The revised catalog description will read as follows:

To be admitted to the Walker College of Business, a student must:

1. Obtain credit for at least 60 semester hours
2. Obtain a cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.5 based on at least twelve graded semester hours at Appalachian State University

3. Remove all grades of "I" (incomplete) from her/his academic record. Students with outstanding grades of "I" will NOT be admitted to the Walker College of Business.
4. Obtain credit for: ENG 1000 with a minimum grade of "C," ENG 1100, MAT 1030
5. Obtain credit for the following College of Business lower level core courses with an overall grade-point average of at least 2.0: ACC 1100, ACC 2110, ECO 2030, ECO 2040, ECO 2100, LAW 2150
6. Pass a College of Business basic Computer Skills Test*

** Students who do not pass the basic Computer Skills Proficiency Test will be required to pass CIS 2025 to satisfy the basic Computer Skills Proficiency Test admission requirement. (Students will be given no more than two opportunities to pass the basic Computer Skills Proficiency Test before being required to take CIS 2025; however, students will not be required to retest before taking this course.)*

2. For business majors, change the requirement to enroll in 4000 level College of Business courses to include a "C" or better in ENG 3100 or BE 3340. The revised catalog description will read as follows:

SPECIAL NOTE ABOUT ENROLLMENT IN UPPER LEVEL BUSINESS CLASSES:

Enrollment by undergraduates in 3000 and 4000 level courses in the College of Business is limited to students admitted to the College of Business, except for the following courses: CIS 3050, FIN 3680, MGT 3630, MKT 3050, POM 3650, and, for non-business majors only, FIN 3010 and MGT 3010.

Non-business majors will be allowed to enroll in other 3000 and 4000 level College of Business courses that are required by their non-business major, a required concentration, or a required minor. Non-business majors can request permits for required business courses not listed above in the College of Business Advising Center in 2126 Raley Hall.

To enroll in any 3000 or 4000 level course in the College of Business, including those listed above, students must have a cumulative GPA of at least 2.0 and must have completed all course prerequisites. Only juniors or seniors may enroll in 3000 level courses and only seniors may enroll in 4000 level courses. Business majors must have earned a "C" or better in ENG 3100 or BE 3340 to enroll in 4000 level College of Business courses.

VOTE 9

YES 13

NO 0

ABSTAIN 0

Proposals POM 1.0607 and POM 2.0607 from the Department of Computer Information Systems were approved as follows (EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2008):

1. Course additions:

POM 3660. Supply Chain Management (3).On Demand.

The objective of the course is to enable students to understand the concept of supply chain management and its importance in both strategic and operational planning. Topics covered include the intra-company relationships between operations and other organizational functions as well as the inter-company relationships among suppliers, products, distributors, retailers and consumers in the supply chain. The course will also discuss the problems and issues confronting supply chain managers, and the concepts, models, and techniques they use to solve those problems.

POM 3670. Six Sigma and Quality Management (3).On Demand.

This course will cover topics on the quality system, quality conformance, the management system for quality, the Six Sigma system, organizing for Six Sigma, selecting winning Six

Sigma projects, leading a Six Sigma project team, and the Six Sigma tool kit. Also, the course will discuss several methods for Six Sigma and quality management including quality assurance, measurement, reliability, process control charts, and sampling techniques. In order to understand the real life applications of quality management, various real-world cases will be discussed.

VOTE 10

YES 13

NO 0

ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Jeff Butts noted that the next item on the agenda is to consider the proposals from the Deans' Council for a new General Education curriculum structure and approval process (GenEd 07-08-1, GenEd 07-08-2, and GenEd 07-08-3). He also noted that an email was distributed to the entire faculty to extend the privilege of speaking to the AP&P Committee members regarding these proposals. Dr. Butts asked for a show of hands from those attending today's meeting who wish to address the committee. Five people indicated that they would like to speak. Dr. Butts asked the speakers to keep their comments brief because he would need to limit each speaker to three minutes.

Dr. Butts outlined a plan that would allow as much time as possible for those speaking, responding, or asking questions. He said that he will go down the list and call on each person who has indicated that they would like to speak. He asked each person to begin by introducing themselves for the benefit of our new committee members. Following the speakers' comments, Dr. Butts will then ask for responses from the Faculty Coordinator and from the Director of General Education. After that, discussions will be turned over to the AP&P Committee members for consideration as Item 6.D under "New Business."

Dr. Butts asked everyone in attendance if that was an agreeable process for this agenda item. Hearing no objections, he began by reading two emails that he had received in response to the message that was sent to the faculty. The first email was from Dr. Jeff Hirst, Professor in the Department of Mathematical Sciences. His comments were as follows:

"I looked through the Gen Ed proposals and noticed one point. In part B of the form, under section 3a, it is asserted that 'the new curriculum calls for more involvement by tenure-track faculty members,'

On the other hand, in section 5, it is claimed that: 'Since the new curriculum represents the same number of credit hours as the old (44), there should be no additional cost.'

If we could hire tenure-track faculty (with terminal degrees) at the same price as adjuncts, I believe that we would hire fewer adjuncts. If tenure-track faculty are actually more expensive, then the cost analysis in the proposal is suspect.

If I were a member of AP&P, I would want a significantly more detailed cost/benefit analysis before supporting this proposal.

Please feel free to share my observations with anyone."

The second email was from Dr. Johnny Waters, Professor and Chair of the Department of Geology. His comments were as follows:

“I am asking you to table GenEd 07-08-3: Proposed approval process for the new General Education Curriculum or to advocate sending it back to the General Education Task Force for further deliberation. My rationale for the proposed action is as follows:

1. Unlike the goals and outcomes of the proposed changes in the General Education, the detailed approval process for courses in the new General Education Curriculum has not been subjected to serious public discussion.
2. I am strongly opposed to members of the task force having the power to forward nominations to membership on the faculty oversight committees.
3. I believe the entire faculty committee appointment process deserves further consideration. Departments have had little opportunity to discuss this critical aspect of the Gen Ed reforms with members of the task force. Departments and individual faculty members did have the opportunity to discuss goals, outcomes and distribution of credits in the Gen Ed model, and many important changes were made by the task force in response to those comments. The implementation process is just as important, if not more so, but the opportunity for similar dialog has been lacking.”

Dr. Butts noted for the record that their comments have been received. He then asked the other speakers to share their comments or concerns with the committee.

Ms. Kathy Smith, Director of Advising in the Walker College of Business stated that she and her staff deal with students on a day-to-day basis. She is concerned about the implementation of the proposed General Education curriculum and the real issues of being ready to advise students in order to meet the implementation date of Fall, 2009. She feels that the implementation date deserves a closer look.

Dr. Neva Specht, Associate Professor and Assistant Chair, stated that she is bringing the following two concerns from the Department of History: 1) The department is concerned about the structure of the approval process for the new General Education curriculum, specifically the recommendation that only two faculty members from history would be allowed to serve on the approval committees for “Historical Studies” and “Historical and Social Perspectives;” and 2) Scheduling faculty workload in the department in terms of meeting demand for seats in classes. She would like to see more detail about numbers and sections that might be needed. The department is concerned that the implementation process has not been worked out in sufficient detail.

Dr. Heather Hulburt, Assistant Dean for Instructional Programs in the Walker College of Business, voiced her concerns about logistics and the day-to-day advising of students. She also spoke for the Department of Computer Information Systems to relay their concern about the technology piece of the proposed general education structure with questions about why there are no credit hours assigned.

Dr. Tony Calamai, Professor and Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, communicated first as a representative and Chair of the Council of Chairs. Within the last week, the main comments he received were regarding the possibility of implementation under the current timeline. Dr. Calamai also spoke as a Science faculty member. He asked everyone to understand that the Physics and Astronomy Department has the least to lose if this new curriculum is adopted, making it clear that his concerns are not about protecting his turf. It is more about principle. He believes that this is a good idea, but there still needs to be some tweaking of the body of the proposal for this to work. He pointed specifically to the sections on Science Inquiry, Quantitative Literacy, Mathematics and Natural Science Education. The phrase “whatever the approach” leaves

it open for pseudo science proposals. He has received the same concerns from other departmental chairs.

Dr. Mark Ginn, Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Mathematical Sciences, questioned the committee structure for the approval of general education courses and the cost of this curriculum, noting that increasing the number of tenure-track faculty in proportion to non tenure-track faculty would be an additional cost. He voiced concerns about hiring adjuncts to teach upper level courses to replace tenure-track faculty who are teaching in the general education curriculum.

Dr. Butts thanked the five speakers, and he asked Dr. Mike Mayfield to respond if he wished to do so, keeping the remarks brief. Following Dr. Mayfield, then Dr. Butts will turn it back to the committee.

Dr. Mike Mayfield, Faculty Coordinator of General Education and Professor in the Department of Geography and Planning responded first to the concerns about implementation. Yes, it will be a challenge. Now is the time to move forward. We need to make curriculum changes. He talked about the cost of implementing the first year seminar, with less overhead and more money put into teaching additional sections (low 80's to 115 sections per year). By reducing overhead, we'll be able to offer more sections. We don't anticipate a lot of additional overhead.

Regarding the timeline and feasibility, he responded that yes, we do have some issues to work through. The process we have followed for the past three years, starting with the College of Arts and Sciences task force, has taken a long time, and we feel we are ready to move forward with the implementation process.

Regarding the sciences, we think we've addressed that. We altered the approach for science, but kept the requirements the same overall.

The LEAP report emphasizes the importance of integrative learning. The proposed model does just that. Our proposed goals and learning outcomes map very closely with those of the LEAP report, even though our proposal came out well before the LEAP report was published. The proposed general education is built around faculty governance.

Regarding committee structures, the appointment process is specified in Proposal GenEd07-08-3 (Provost, Deans, Departmental Chairs). The appointments will ultimately be made by the Provost. A lot of work and time has gone into planning and proposing a new general education program.

Ms. Carter Hammett-McGarry, Director of General Education, responded that they recognize that many of us are already thinking of Fall 2008 and Fall 2009. The General Education Task Force expects that many of our current core courses would fit in the new general education curriculum with some attention to tying the content to the goals and outcomes, so she wants to make it clear that they don't intend to expect new courses across the board. There will be a gradual implementation and they will look to you and your departments for assistance to make this work.

Dr. Mayfield responded to Dr. Calamai's concern about the phrase "whatever the approach" by calling on Dr. Ray Williams, Chair of the Sciences subcommittee of the General Education Task Force.

Dr. Ray Williams, Associate Professor and Assistant Chair of the Department of Biology, spoke as a member of the General Education Task Force. The coursework in science will be approved by the science committee, which will insure that legitimate scientific approaches are used in the curriculum. The proposal recognizes what scientists do and how scientific knowledge is developed and tested. He stressed that the science committee will determine the coursework.

Dr. Calamai gave an example of why it still needs to be tweaked here and there. With the current language in the proposal, how would we prevent, for example, a science course on ghostbusters. He believes that the proposed general education is a good idea but that we need to tweak it, improve it, and tighten it up.

Dr. Mayfield stated that we will be open to suggestions.

Dr. Butts asked for any additional comments.

Ms. Martha Stephenson, Director of Advising and Orientation, spoke out and said, yes, we are scared, scared of the unknown from an advising point of view. However, the current checklist for the core curriculum is boring and set without very much flexibility. The proposed general education offers exciting possibilities for our students.

Dr. Butts turned this agenda item back over to the committee's regular forum. He reminded the AP&P Committee members that we need to have a motion on the floor in order to continue discussions. Does the committee wish to consider these three proposals relating to a new general education curriculum as a package or individually?

Dr. Butts asked: Is there a motion relative to the proposals from the Dean's Council?

A motion was made and seconded to accept Proposal GenEd 07-08-1, the request to approve the structure of a new General Education as recommended by the General Education Task Force's Final Report, and revised by the Deans' Council on September 5, 2007.

Dr. Butts noted that the floor is now open for comments and questions from the AP&P Committee members.

Dr. Rodney Duke questioned the plan for no credit hours for the communication and technology portion of the General Education model.

Dr. Mayfield responded that the information and communication technology subcommittee is still meeting and working on the issue.

Dr. Ann Viles, Professor and Associate University Librarian, and a member of the General Education Task Force, spoke on behalf of the technology subcommittee. Dr. Viles, who has been involved with the planning of the ICT Literacy section of the proposal, noted that this is an area that still needs further development, and that a committee is working on that. The committee is considering recommending an assessment test, but they need to gather more information.

Dr. Jon Saken voiced his concern about the total lack of a real assessment plan. Still doesn't tell how the whole process will fit together. The current system is clunky, yes. This is experimental. Other schools have been mentioned that are also trying this approach, but they still don't have any assessment or results to share. He is reluctant to turn our students into guinea pigs.

Dr. Dave Haney referred everyone to pages 33-37 of the General Education Task Force final report. It outlines a more detailed assessment plan than we have for other academic programs. He noted that AP&P does not ask for assessment plans. The task force recognizes that this and other areas

need more development, and referred the committee to the cover memo, which outlined seven areas that will need further consideration and additional AP&P action.

Ms. Carter Hammett-McGarry: The reason we presented a framework for assessment rather than a prescribed plan is that we understand from assessment experts that assessment needs to come from faculty. To prevent assessment from becoming a burden on students and faculty as an added component, faculty consultants need to identify the appropriate artifacts to be used in determining if goals and outcomes are appropriate and are being met. The role of assessment is to suggest changes and improvements.

Dr. Saken noted that we were not assessing individual courses and that we should have a fallback plan if this curriculum does not work.

Dr. Tina Hogan, Senior Research Associate in the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning noted that we haven't had any assessment on the General Education level. The current core curriculum does not have an assessment plan and it does not give us information on what we need. We will have to use specific course samplings to gather evidence.

Mr. Thomas Brigman stated that no one will argue the fact that the current core curriculum is archaic. The proposed General Education is a good way to improve. Our job is never complete. We can always find room for improvement. Computer and Information technology is necessary to create students abilities to compete in a global market. Regarding the science concerns talked about earlier, he believes it would be a disservice to us as students to not take a science. Science is what we function around daily.

Mr. Don Rankins, University Registrar

He noted that the Registrar's Office has been involved already in the implementation issue. Consultation with Carter has helped him to understand what a theme is, and the need to track students through their career. Try to find what we should do. We have to start now to strive to reach a Fall 2009 or later, if necessary, implementation date. Plan tomorrow what the sciences will do. Look at course work that proves proficiency. We must start now, or we'll never move forward to end up with a better curriculum.

Dr. Ron Marden asked a procedural question about who makes the final decision after this is considered by the AP&P Committee. Does it go to the Provost next? He asked what the Provost thought of the proposal.

Dr. Haney said that yes, AP&P's recommendation will go to the Provost. He noted that Dr. Aeschleman has been very involved and is supportive. The Provost approved the goals and outcomes that were prepared and submitted to him from the General Education Task Force. His response is very positive. Dr. Haney also noted that the Deans' Council voted unanimously to approve the proposals, amending the section on double-counting courses in the major and general education, on September 5, 2007.

Dr. Jon Beebe asked a question about the 9 semester hour maximum double count and who would determine what counted for both the major and general education.

Dr. Haney replied that that would be determined by the major department. There would be no limit on double-counting courses that were required by the major but outside the major department.

Dr. Beebe asked specifically about the 6 semester hours required in music history and literature that currently count toward the core humanities requirement.

Carter Hammett-McGarry: We have met with the Dean and the Associate Dean in the School of Music and addressed their questions about their required general education music history and literature courses. The current courses have prerequisites that are specific to music majors. These will require some modification to be appropriate for all students or there may be ways to team up with other departments in themes within perspectives that can ensure music students get true general education and also meet major requirements.

Dr. Beebe asked about the PE activity courses (currently Marching Band in music) and how they would change.

Dr. Haney replied that the wellness requirement remained at 2 semester hours, and would require reflection on wellness issues as well as activity. He noted that this issue has also been discussed with the Dean and the Associate Dean in the School of Music.

Carter Hammett-McGarry: The wellness subgroup of the task force included representatives from departments that teach the current PE/Wellness courses. The HLES faculty indicated that they require reflection in their PE classes now. It seems appropriate for musicians to be aware of the importance of caring for their bodies throughout their life.

Dr. Gayle Weitz: Although she applauds the General Education program, she stated that we have to have a few more items ironed out. Number one concern is the cost. How can you shift faculty? We can't put adjuncts in some of those upper level courses to allow tenure track faculty to teach in the Gen Ed courses. The overhead will be reduced for tenure faculty to teach these courses. This is a travesty. We're currently offering 20 pilot courses. Yes, I am currently teaching one of those pilot courses, but how can you clone me to do this? Faculty have not been given enough opportunity for involvement in developing the general education model. There has been too much administration involvement and not enough faculty input. Compared to the current core curriculum, the proposed new Gen Ed is good and is way overdue.

Dr. Haney responded to the cost issue. The Provost and Dr. Tim Burwell, Vice Provost for Resource Management, both say that the proposed curriculum plan is do-able. The current average class size (25) and student/faculty ratio (17-18 to one) will remain the same. The first year seminar will take up 3 of the 44 Gen Ed hours, whereas currently Freshman Seminar, is an extra cost outside of the core curriculum of about \$300,000 per year. 15% of freshmen do not return; and, moving the second writing course to the sophomore year will save over 15 sections of freshmen comps. General Education is a major priority of the Provost, and therefore it will receive the necessary resources. The current core curriculum is very expensive and inefficient.

Dr. Sue Keefe, Chair of the General Education Task Force, and Professor in the Department of Anthropology addressed the following points: If you want a general education where you know exactly what you have, then keep what you have. The proposed curriculum reflects national trends and recommends this campus' strengths. Yes, we are asking for a leap of faith. A lot of departments and faculty have been involved in developing this new model for general education. We have to continue to do that to get a quality product. The current core curriculum is concrete with no room for changes. For example, is the current computer designator really meeting the needs of our

students today? We don't have to have a one size fits all attitude. We are looking for flexibility in this new model. She strongly encouraged the committee members to think about what CAN BE!

Dr. Paulette Marty, a member of the General Education Task Force, and Assistant Professor in the Department of Theatre and Dance spoke very briefly. She stressed that the proposed Gen Ed is open to review on a regular cycle, while the present core curriculum has no such assessment structure.

Dr. Butts reminded everyone to be as brief as possible because of the time.

Dr. Rodney Duke said that even though it may appear to some people that faculty will have to give up upper level courses, that is not necessarily true. The Gen Ed program has a vertical dimension. Faculty members can create thematic gen ed courses at the upper level as well as at the lower. Will someone on the task force clarify if that is true?

Dr. Haney confirmed that this was true.

Dr. Saken: Faculty will be pulled away from courses in the degree programs.

Dr. Mayfield pointed out that some of the experimental courses have enrollments of up to 60 students.

Dr. Saken: Faculty development will cost time and money. Costs for faculty will be much higher.

At 4:59 p.m. Dr. Butts noted that the rules of the committee require us to cease business unless a motion to extend the meeting is approved.

Dr. Butts entertained a motion to extend the meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to extend the meeting until 5:15 p.m., however Dr. Butts felt that more time would be necessary so he solicited an amendment to that motion to extend the meeting until we have completed the General Education proposals.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the original motion to extend the meeting until we have time to complete the discussions regarding the first proposal.

Dr. Butts asked for a vote on the motion which has been amended to extend the meeting to complete the discussions on Proposal #1. **The motion failed.**

VOTE 11 YES 6 NO 7 ABSTAIN 0

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

VOTE 12 YES 8 NO 5 ABSTAIN 0

Discussions continued as follows.

Dr. Saken: Asked for a response to his concerns about faculty development time and money.

Dr. Mayfield: People will be able to focus their own expertise in the new curriculum rather than working up survey courses.

Dr. Allen Bryant: He noted that his colleagues are concerned with “What’s the hurry?” It is being rushed. Why pilot courses, and also launch an entire framework? Those he talks to in the College of Education feel hurried. Please clarify.

Dr. Haney clarified by stating that this proposal is for a framework, a process, and not a set curriculum.

Dr. Weitz: Can approve with strings attached. Would like to see a concrete example (like the Art Department would be a good example of a cost analysis).

Dr. Haney explained that that is not possible at this point because the new curriculum depends on decisions the department would need to make about their involvement in Gen Ed. Current costs are easy to predict because we are just looking at a menu of courses. The analysis would also depend on the contributions to Gen Ed that other departments and colleges would be making, which will change – for example, the College of Education and the College of Business have very little involvement in the current core curriculum, but would have opportunities in the new Gen Ed.

Dr. Weitz: I am uncomfortable with voting on an incomplete proposal (the technology thing, for example). But, we must start somewhere.

Mr. Mark Malloy: Appalachian State University continues to be highly rated, yet we have a stale general education that doesn’t work, so it is not the core curriculum that is helping us obtain the high ratings. If we improve it, then our ratings should go even higher. Positive comments.

Mr. Thomas Brigman asked a procedural question. Are we allowed to make amendments to the proposals?

Dr. Butts responded that as Chair, he would be reluctant to amend from the floor. It would be better to remand back to the committee to study specific concerns.

Dr. Saken brought up an additional issue – that of transfer students (to be dealt with by a task force).

Carter Hammett-McGarry responded to Dr. Saken that we realize transfer students have unique circumstances. She participated in the Summer Institute for the UNC Campuses and the North Carolina Community College System to discuss issues related to transfer of credits within curricular reform taking place at the senior institutions and the community colleges. She had conversations with members of the transfer advisory committee (TAC) which works closely to make revisions to the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement (CAA) about what we are proposing and how to maintain the seamless transition for transfer students. Appalachian is ahead of our sister institutions because we have constituted a Transfer Task Force with 18-20 representatives from ASU and our main feeder community colleges. The conversations will focus on getting away from course by course equivalents to aligning ourselves with goals and learning outcomes. The goal is to communicate better, promote flexibility, and be open to the needs of our specific constituencies.

Dr. Butts noted that we are a little past the 5:15 extension time. Does the committee wish to extend the meeting time with one more motion?

A motion was made to extend the meeting time by 5 minutes, however it was not seconded.

Without a motion to extend the time of the meeting, Dr. Butts noted at 5:20 p.m. that this meeting is recessed until our next scheduled meeting which will be held on Wednesday, November 7, 2007. The first item of business at that next meeting will be to continue this discussion.

No adjournment (therefore the Minutes for the October 3 AP&P Committee meeting will only be submitted in DRAFT form at the November 7 meeting).

Continuation of the October 3, 2007 AP&P Committee Meeting on 11/07/07

The Academic Policies & Procedures Committee met on Wednesday, November 7, 2007 in the William C. Strickland Conference Room of I.G. Greer Hall to continue the unfinished discussions from the October 3, 2007 AP&P meeting regarding the proposals for a new General Education curriculum and approval process.

Committee members present: Dr. Jeff Butts (Chair), Dr. Jon Beebe, Mr. John Boyd, Dr. Allen Bryant, Dr. Dinesh Dave, Dr. Rodney Duke, Mr. Mark Malloy, Dr. Ron Marden, Dr. Jon Saken, Dr. Kay Taylor, Dr. Gayle Weitz, Mr. Thomas Brigman (Parliamentarian), Ms. Kendra Johnson, and Ms. Lindsay Tigar. Committee member excused: Ms. Erin Boyer.

Dr. Jeff Butts called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and he explained where we are in terms of parliamentary actions. This committee did not complete the consideration of the last agenda item under New Business on October 3. That meeting went into recess. There was no adjournment, therefore we must begin today's meeting by continuing the discussions from that agenda before we can move on to the items of business for the November 7 meeting. At the appropriate time, we will need to adjourn the October 3 meeting, and then immediately start the November 7 meeting. Dr. Butts reminded everyone that the motion on the floor that was made and seconded to accept Proposal GenEd 07-08-1 (the request to approve the structure of a new General Education) remains open for discussion.

Dr. Butts noted that everyone should have received copies of a number of items related to the Gen Ed proposals that were prepared by Dr. Dave Haney, Ms. Carter Hammett-McGarry, and Dr. Mike Mayfield. He also noted that everyone received a draft copy of the minutes from the October 3 Gen Ed discussions, but we will not be acting on those minutes for approval today because those minutes are incomplete. The draft copy was provided so that everyone could read the summaries of what has transpired up to this point. Please send any corrections to those minutes to Ms. Lesa Felker.

Everyone also received a memo from Dr. Jon Beebe on November 1 of concerns related to the proposed Gen Ed curriculum. The response to those concerns was then distributed on November 6.

Dr. Butts clarified that visitors that wish to address the committee at today's meeting will be given the privilege of the floor with a limit of 3 minutes each to make their statements. When those statements are completed, the committee will take over by going into discussions of the motion on the floor.

Dr. Butts began by reading two emails that had been sent directly to him to be shared with the committee. The first email was from Dr. Mary Reichel, Professor and University Librarian. Her comments were as follows:

"Thank you for inviting comments from the entire faculty regarding the General Education curriculum and approval process proposals. I will be out of town when the discussion is resumed during Wednesday's AP&P meeting, so I would like to express my support for the proposals in this email.

The process used by the General Education Task Force serves as a model for all of us involved in policy or curricular issues. Communication was excellent through the web site and email, and I was impressed with the forums. Attendance was great, and, while I know that not everyone was happy with the answers they received, I thought members of the Task Force were responsive and open to suggestions.

From the Library perspective, the new general education proposal is much stronger than the past Freshman Seminar program. I like the emphasis on critical thinking abilities which are crucial for life-long learning and individual fulfillment. The inclusion of information literacy abilities in the vertical model is robust and suits students' learning stages with more complex and specific information and applications in the junior and senior years. Another strength is the involvement of tenured and tenure track faculty teaching courses with subject matter that the faculty, as well as the students, will love.

I hope that the proposed General Education program will receive full approval at your November 7th meeting."

The second email was from Dr. Kate Brinko, Interim Director of the Hubbard Center for Faculty Development. Her comments were as follows:

"Please pass along to AP&P my endorsement of the proposed General Education curriculum. I have the utmost respect for the committee, who invested literally hundreds of hours in researching other models, debating the merits of the models and consulting with other faculty in developing this model.

I read that some members of AP&P wish to retain and improve our current model. Please note that this is the same model I had as an undergraduate 30 years ago! Surely we as educators do not believe that a curriculum devised so long ago is still adequate for preparing citizens for the 21st century.

I endorse the proposed model because it is ambitious, robust and has a much greater potential for fostering deep learning. It will require faculty to think differently and reinvent their teaching, which in turn will require students to think differently and be better prepared for the great social, political and economic challenges that they are facing."

Dr. Butts noted for the record that their comments have been received. He then asked the other speakers to share their comments or concerns with the committee.

Dr. Lynn Moss Sanders, Coordinator of the Heltzer Honors Program and Professor in the Department of English began by stating that she is here to speak in favor of the proposed Gen Ed curriculum from both of those perspectives.

First, from the Honors Program point of view, Dr. Sanders said that the current core curriculum is not serving our best students well. Most of the Honors students enter ASU with at least a full semester's worth of AP credits from high school. They pick and choose a few core curriculum courses to fulfill their remaining core requirements, but essentially they have received their liberal arts education in high school AP classes that were clearly geared toward "teaching the test." That is a problem, but my understanding of the proposed new curriculum is that students will not be able to exempt core requirements so easily, and they will be required to take interdisciplinary courses that give them a broad, liberal arts background.

Second, from her perspective as a faculty member in the English Department, Dr. Sanders stated that she and her colleagues (almost everyone in the Department) support the new Gen Ed. She pointed out that Dr. Georgia Rhoades, composition director in the Department of English, served on the Gen Ed Task Force, and that Dr. Rhoades argued successfully for a model for teaching writing that reflects the best current research and practice. Dr. Sanders also emphasized that if our graduates do not write well, the English Department is blamed. She asked the AP&P Committee members to please let them do the best job they can of teaching writing to our students by approving the proposed curriculum and the vertical model for writing instruction.

Dr. Sanders also presented one other perspective. As a parent of a prospective ASU student, she supports this proposed curriculum. She spends a lot of time with prospective students and their parents in her position, and she has received very positive feedback about our interdisciplinary honors curriculum, especially our first year seminars on academic special topics; those seminars are the model for the first-year courses in the proposed curriculum. Her son plans to attend ASU next year, and he hopes to enroll in the School of Music. She is happy with his plans, but she also wants to make sure that he receives the kind of strong liberal arts background that his sister is getting at a small private college. Our competition is not what you would imagine. Many of our high-ability students are weighing us against schools like Elon, Guilford, and Davidson, in other words, liberal arts colleges with highly innovative general education programs. Their parents are often quite willing to borrow the money to pay for the education they want their children to have.

She shared one brief story of a recent Chancellor's Scholar who started to turn down a full scholarship from ASU to attend UNC-Chapel Hill instead, until the student heard about our Freshman Honors seminar courses.

Dr. Jeanne Dubino, Professor and Chair of the Department of English began by stating that she started at ASU as the Chair of the English Department last year. She said that initially there was some opposition in the English Department, but even those who were most strongly against it have turned around. She understood that some concerns focusing on implementation and resources were raised at the last AP&P meeting. Dr. Dubino stated that before she left Plymouth State University, she served on a general education task force there for two years, and that they also had concerns. But, she also reported that their program is working beautifully, and it is a much stronger general education program than they had before. Additionally, many Plymouth State University faculty members have become re-energized through teaching general education courses. Dr. Dubino supports the proposed Gen Ed curriculum and she believes that those challenges regarding implementation and resources can be overcome.

Dr. Steve Seagle, Professor and Chair of the Department of Biology noted that he can't speak as a vote one way or the other from the faculty. He does feel that people had plenty of opportunities for attending meetings. He can say that not a lot are either against or for the new curriculum. People he has talked to don't find great objections.

Dr. Seagle spoke on the science component. He explained that the Department of Biology teaches 1,700 students each semester in the laboratory sciences. We've been meeting for at least two years already and we have separated our majors from the non-majors so that we can determine new options for how we go about teaching the non-major. We're looking at the science component and where it is going. Biology supports the new Gen Ed curriculum.

Dr. Michael Krenn, Professor and Chair of the Department of History noted that his department has voiced its opposition to the proposed curriculum. The main concern from the department is the question of resources. He continues to hear talk about pools of money that the Provost has to use at his discretion. The proposed Gen Ed will generate an awful lot of work for faculty and for departmental chairs in order to implement this. Dr. Krenn stressed that his people already do a lot, and that if departments are going to be working out new course proposals, that there must be a guarantee that resources will be there. People are stretched to their limits.

Dr. Butts thanked all of the visitors for making their statements. The issue is now back in the hands of the committee members to consider the motion to approve the Gen Ed proposal #1. He further explained that the floor is extended only to the members of the AP&P Committee and to the presenters of the proposal.

Mr. Mark Malloy stated that the only resistance he is continually hearing is "show me the money," the resources.

Dr. Jon Beebe explained that he is not opposed to change. We have a chance to try something new and he compared it to having a chance to try out a new drug. What kinds of symptoms caused us to need the drug? What are the side effects? What types of interactions will it generate? What will it do to or for us? He feels that we need to not go forward with so many unknowns.

Dr. Jon Saken echoed what Dr. Beebe said. There are too many holes. We are taking a risk. We would be experimenting on our students. That is a risk for the students. Some things and concerns could be fleshed out before we approve this. It is rushed with too many holes. If the holes were filled, we would be more in favor of it. The information and communication technology literacy component and the quantitative literacy component are not fleshed out.

Dr. Holly Hirst asked if the AP&P Committee would approve a major curriculum without course content. Is this putting the cart before the horse?

Dr. Allen Bryant talked about the specific item in Dr. Beebe's memo that addressed licensure concerns for professional programs. Standards are a concern. Not sure the student outcomes and performances that licensing programs must address will be there. Although it is true that accreditation is performance-based, DPI has a long list of standards related to what students must do in Gen Ed courses. We don't know if those courses will still be there.

Dr. Gayle Weitz wants to approve this, but is nervous about the holes. When we approve this, what happens to the parts that are still in question as noted in the cover memo? Would it go through another screening to us?

Dr. Dave Haney referred to point number 4 in the cover memo, and he responded that yes, we do recognize that there are items such as the Information and Communication Technology Literacy component, and a number of other items that AP&P will still need to exercise authority over.

Dr. Weitz: AP&P approves courses and degree matters. This is a whole structural change. Are we granting control to Gen Ed?

Dr. Haney: That's up to you, the committee, as the final body to rule on the curriculum. You have the right to make recommendations on any aspect of the curriculum, including general education, or to bring other concerns to the table.

Dr. Bryant: What is the logic behind bringing it to the AP&P Committee with so many items remaining to be addressed?

Dr. Haney read the last paragraph from the cover memo which stated as follows:

"Many units on campus are already putting significant time and institutional resources into the curriculum proposed here, including departments and colleges, who are reexamining major requirements and piloting courses; the registrar's office; advising and orientation; admissions; various areas in the division of student development; and academic affairs. However, the conceptual framework is now sufficiently developed to be presented for AP&P consideration, and the direction of subsequent efforts in the area of general education by both administration and faculty will be largely determined by AP&P's acceptance, rejection, or modification of this framework. Therefore it is being submitted at this stage, even though the above items (in number 4) remain unresolved."

Dr. Saken: This is eventually going to be approved, but we have too many holes. For example, transfer student issues. We shouldn't rule on something this big without completing the work.

Dr. Haney: If the implementation would be delayed for another year, that delay would cost more than \$300,000. That is an additional resource issue. But, it is your choice.

Dr. Saken: I am confused. Where is that money being spent now?

Dr. Haney listed the following items on where the money is being spent now, keeping one core curriculum going while a new one is being planned: the Director of General Education, the Faculty Coordinator of General Education, the Assistant Director of General Education, and the current Freshman Seminar Program. A program that affects 14,000 students is expensive. Money could be much better allocated.

Dr. Saken: Because progress went forward on this without completing the entire package, does that mean that any unit can go forward with an incomplete proposal?

Dr. Haney: The General Education Task Force was charged by the Provost to develop a signature general education program. It is the administrative responsibility to support the program. The Provost plans to provide more resources for grants for faculty, for example, to develop new courses. If you don't like this proposed curriculum, we'll keep going for another year.

Dr. Ron Marden noted that what he was about to suggest might be premature. He said that he is mostly hearing the same concerns that we had the last time we met. He called for the question and moved to cut off debate. **The motion was approved to end discussions regarding the Gen Ed Proposal #1.**

VOTE 13 YES 11 NO 3 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Butts clarified that the motion on the floor at this time is to consider the approval of Proposal GenEd 07-08-1, the request to approve the structure of a new General Education as recommended by the General Education Task Force (GETF) Final Report and revised by the Deans' Council on 9/5/07. The motion passed.

VOTE 14 YES 9 NO 5 ABSTAIN 0

(EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2009):

The proposed catalog description of the new General Education will read as follows (although please note that it will change as individual components are more thoroughly developed and approved):

GENERAL EDUCATION GOALS AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

MISSION STATEMENT

General education at Appalachian State University is anchored in the ideals and practices of liberal education and is designed to prepare students to fulfill the responsibilities and meet the challenges presented by a changing world. By engaging in the discovery, interpretation, and creation of knowledge throughout the undergraduate curriculum and becoming involved in educationally focused co-curricular activities, students learn to adapt to new environments, integrate knowledge from diverse sources, and continue learning throughout their lives. Recognizing the growing significance of an interconnected world, Appalachian's general education program also encourages meaningful connections between local regions, especially in the Southern Appalachian Mountains, and global contexts.

EDUCATIONAL GOALS

Appalachian's general education program prepares students for

- I. Thinking critically and creatively
- II. Communicating effectively
- III. Making local to global connections
- IV. Understanding responsibilities of community membership

I. Thinking critically and creatively

RATIONALE:

Appalachian's general education program seeks to cultivate lifelong learners who can understand, question, revise, and generate knowledge through thinking that is both *critical* in its analysis and evaluation of knowledge and *creative* in its integration and generation of knowledge. Critical and creative thinkers are conscious of how their own positions as well as the history of ideas influence their thought, and they also adjust their thinking as they interpret, evaluate, and reflect based on increasingly sophisticated intellectual values. Critical and creative thought requires the ability to integrate knowledge from a variety of domains and to transfer knowledge from one domain to another, while at the same time recognizing the distinctiveness and limitations of different methodologies and theoretical paradigms. This ability is best fostered by a combination of disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to learning and by the employment of a variety of critical and creative strategies, including reading, writing, observing, quantifying, using the scientific method, translating, creating, and performing.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Students will

- A. Recognize, differentiate, and effectively employ appropriate and increasingly sophisticated strategies to collect and interpret information;
- B. Successfully integrate disparate concepts and information when interpreting, solving problems, evaluating, creating, and making decisions;
- C. Examine and evaluate how their own personal, historical, and cultural perspectives affect the discovery and generation of knowledge;
- D. Construct persuasive arguments in increasingly complex contexts;
- E. Apply theories from a variety of disciplines and advance convincing reasons to connect as well as differentiate theories from different domains of knowledge.

II. Communicating effectively

RATIONALE:

The general education program prepares students to employ modes of communication that can help communities reach both authentic consensus and respectful disagreement. In a two-way interaction, communicating effectively leads to discovery and productive changes in the sender, who may be a writer, speaker, dancer, musician, visual artist, or actor, as well as in the receiver, who may be listening, reading, or watching. As both senders and receivers, successful communicators interact effectively with people of both similar and different experiences and values. They adapt their communication skills with increasing fluency and sophistication to new and increasingly complex situations. Communicating effectively requires sophisticated reading skills in conjunction with a high level of quantitative, technological, and information literacy.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Students will

- A. Articulate and comprehend effectively, using verbal or non-verbal communication suitable to topic, purpose, and audience;
- B. Use writing effectively to discover and develop ideas and to articulate positions in contexts of increasing complexity;
- C. Make rhetorical decisions appropriate to topic, purpose, and audience while correctly using the conventions of standard written English;
- D. Determine the scope of information needed in specific research contexts and successfully identify, locate, evaluate, use, and communicate information from various media;
- E. Read actively and analytically at the college level and synthesize and apply information and ideas from their reading across disciplines;
- F. Know, apply, and communicate college-level quantitative concepts and methods;
- G. Select and use hardware, software applications, databases, and other technologies effectively for both inquiry and communication.

III. Making local to global connections

RATIONALE:

Appalachian State University is both in and of the southern Appalachian region, and it is also part of a world that is globally connected. Life in the twenty-first century requires an understanding of the connections and multi-layered interactions among diverse local and global human cultures, as well as between humans and the natural and physical environments. In this context, the general education program helps to cultivate an active understanding of global change and the effect of human agency on both natural and cultural environments. Students should understand the importance of biodiversity, ecological integrity, and the need to achieve sustainable benefits for communities. Knowledge of other cultures, diverse cultural frames of reference, and alternative perspectives are essential to thinking critically and creatively and to understanding the responsibilities of membership in local, regional, and global communities. The cultivation and maintenance of intercultural

relationships require active cultural understanding, which is achieved by exploring multiple strategies for interacting with other peoples and cultures.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Students will

- A. Analyze past and present relationships between humans and the natural and physical environment;
- B. Evaluate community, natural, and global change through the lens of sustainability;
- C. Demonstrate the ability to think critically and creatively about the relationship between local regions and global issues, processes, trends, and systems;
- D. Demonstrate knowledge of contemporary issues related to cultural diversity in the United States and other areas of the world;
- E. Employ appropriate and increasingly sophisticated means for communicating with people of other cultures.

IV. Understanding responsibilities of community membership

RATIONALE:

General education prepares academically skilled and engaged citizens capable of contributing to the betterment of society and taking responsibility for the common good. Responsible contribution to a vibrant democracy governed by the rule of law requires a basic understanding of the ways in which governments, economies, and societies function. Moral reasoning skills, necessary in a world characterized by often conflicting beliefs and attitudes, enable students to reflect critically on ethical issues and to make reasoned, intelligent judgments about complex moral problems. Effective moral reasoning includes questioning one's own assumptions and beliefs, understanding the reasoning of others, and accepting disagreement about important matters. An understanding of the broad range of past and present moral positions should be accompanied by shared beliefs regarding honesty, integrity, and obligation to others. In addition, fostering the well-being and personal development of students will help them lead thoughtful and purposeful lives in their communities.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Students will

- A. Identify potential consequences that personal choices as well as political, economic, and other social forces may have on individual, societal, and environmental health;
- B. Apply moral reasoning skills to an array of ethical issues confronted by individuals, groups, and communities;
- C. Collaborate effectively with others in shared processes of inquiry and problem-solving;
- D. Apply principles of responsible community membership within and beyond the campus community.

General Education Requirements

The program requires students to complete an integrated curriculum grounded in a liberal education in the arts and sciences. It employs a vertical model consisting of opportunities during each year of enrollment for students to improve their skills in critical thinking, inquiry, analysis, synthesis, written and oral communication, and information and technological literacy. Furthermore, the curriculum provides avenues for synergy between general education and the academic major and active learning within and outside the traditional classroom through linkages with undergraduate research, service learning, international experiences, and leadership development.

The general education curriculum requires a total of 44 semester hours.

This includes the following required coursework:

- 3 s.h. First Year Seminar
- 3 s.h. First Year Writing
- 3 s.h. Second Year Writing

4 s.h.	Quantitative Literacy
2 s.h.	Wellness Literacy
29 s.h.	Perspectives (including 3 s.h. each in fine arts, historical studies, literary studies)
<hr/>	
44 s.h.	TOTAL

Coursework in the major:

3 s.h.	Junior Writing
1 s.h. (min.)	Senior Capstone Experience

To encourage a broad-based general education, most general education courses for students are outside their majors. Students will be allowed to count a maximum of 9 semester hours taught in the department or program of their majors toward general education requirements.

Dr. Weitz asked: Will those items that we talked about earlier that are un-resolved come before this committee? She wants that clarified in the minutes.

Dr. Haney responded: Yes, they will come before this committee.

Dr. Butts noted that the next item on the agenda is to consider the approval of Proposal GenEd 07-08-2, the request to add a new course prefix, UCO (University College), and the request to add the new course UCO 1200, First Year Seminar. **A motion was made and seconded to consider Proposal #2. Discussions followed.**

Dr. Saken questioned the syllabi that were distributed with this proposal are for two totally different courses.

Dr. Mike Mayfield responded that the commonality in the courses was in the learning outcomes, not the specific content. And, he noted that we'll put a lot more time into the proposed syllabi for the first year seminar courses.

Dr. Haney explained that the two syllabi attached to Proposal #2 are the syllabi for two pilot courses that are being taught now. One is Sarah Greenwald's course, and the other is Anna Ward's. The plan for 2008-2009 would be to use the US 1150 (the current Freshman Seminar), but to teach it with the learning outcomes of the new first year seminar. That would make it easier for students entering in 2008 to change to the new catalog in 2009 when the new Gen Ed curriculum would go into effect.

Mr. Thomas Brigman shared his findings about the current Freshman Seminar course. He stated that it was about 50/50 for those who appreciated and for those who disliked the Freshman Seminar course. He stressed the positive points that students had shared with him. They enjoyed the extra items, the tours of specific campus facilities, and the idea of becoming part of the Appalachian family. They liked to connect with other students and felt that it was extremely beneficial to create study groups early in their careers. He was surprised to find out how many students who did not take the Freshman Seminar course did not even know about the University Writing Center. He hopes that the new First Year Seminar course will integrate our new students in some of those same positive ways. It is important to retain that part of the course, as well as to add the academic part that wasn't there before.

Dr. Haney is aware that the current Freshman Seminar is an extended orientation and that some of that would be lost in the new first year seminar. We already have an Orientation Planning Committee in place to look at this issue.

The motion to consider the approval of Proposal GenEd 07-08-2, was approved as follows:
(EFFECTIVE: FALL, 2009)

1. Add a new course prefix, **UCO (University College)**.
2. Course addition:
UCO 1200. First Year Seminar (3).F;S.
The first year seminar engages students and faculty in a shared process of inquiry around a broad, interdisciplinary topic or question. Utilizing at least two different modes of inquiry, as well as varied and engaging pedagogies, this seminar aims to help students develop their abilities to think critically and communicate effectively. It also aims to help students make connections with faculty, peers, the university, and the curriculum. Required of all freshmen not taking HON 1515 (Freshman Honors Seminar).

VOTE 15 YES 14 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Butts noted that the next item on the agenda is to consider the approval of Proposal GenEd 07-08-3, the request to approve the implementation and approval process for the new General Education curriculum. **A motion was made and seconded to consider Proposal #3. Discussions followed.**

Mr. Brigman voiced his concerns about the creation of the General Education Council. He feels that it needs more representation from students. As stated, it only lists one student member (the liaison from the Student General Education Advisory Board). He noted the charge from General Administration for shared governance. There is not enough student representation the way this proposal is currently written.

Dr. Weitz shared several comments with the committee. In the UNC system, there is general agreement that the faculty govern. This council, as proposed, does not adequately represent the faculty. It does not adhere to the current *Faculty Handbook*. If we are replacing the Core Curriculum Committee with the proposed General Education Council, then it should be a standing University Committee just like the CCC. Please refer to section 7.3 of the *Faculty Handbook*. We will have to abide by those procedures. As proposed, it bypasses what we have structured right now. She also echoed Mr. Brigman's concern about the number of undergraduate student representatives (also noting that graduate student representation would not be necessary). She said the membership should be as AP&P is currently, with equitable distribution of faculty representatives. The Chair of the General Education Council should be a faculty member, not an administrator. The charge for the proposed General Education Council is far too expansive. The assessment might be handled by maybe a subcommittee of AP&P that does a review of the Gen Ed. Oversight committees, membership is limited. Need to open the membership to eligible faculty. The approval process is too understated and developed. Spell it out as the *Academic Governance Manual* states. Must either be a standing University Committee, as AP&P is, or a subcommittee of AP&P.

Mr. Brigman totaled up the numbers of members on the proposed committee and he noted that there are 11 faculty, 8 administrators, and 1 student. **He made the motion and it was seconded to amend the original motion to state that the council will include the one student liaison as stated in (i.), and also add 4 student voting members from the SGA.**

Dr. Saken questioned another issue: Who are the voting members? He asked if he could make another motion to amend?

Mr. Brigman said that amendment would not be germane to this issue, therefore it would not be following parliamentary procedures.

Dr. Butts and Dr. Bryant agreed that both issues (amendments) are on the make-up of the committee, so another amendment would be allowed.

Dr. Saken felt strongly that we should limit the voting members to faculty and students only. Others (anyone in administrative positions) should be ex-officio non-voting members. For example, is the First Year Seminar Coordinator considered to be an administrator or a faculty member.

Dr. Haney explained that the First Year Seminar Coordinator is the same as Dr. Mayfield's position (a faculty with a two course release, 6 semester hours of reassigned time). He also noted that when the Gen Ed Task Force was creating the proposed General Education Council that they purposely did not use that system to be like the Core Curriculum Committee. Faculty representation was to be based on the knowledge base of academic expertise, not on the colleges represented by the respective faculty members.

Dr. Saken made a motion to amend Mr. Brigman's amendment by stating that voting members must be limited to representatives from the Gen Ed subcommittees and the student members. This motion was seconded.

That would allow a ratio of 2:1 with 10 voting faculty and 5 voting students, and 0 voting administrators. It was pointed out that no other standing University Committee allows administrators to vote.

An additional amendment to the original motion was approved that confines the voting members to the Chairs of the faculty subcommittees (10), plus the (1) student liaison from the Student General Education Advisory Board and (4) students from the SGA.

VOTE 16 YES 9 NO 4 ABSTAIN 1

Another substitute motion was approved to reduce the number of student representatives from the SGA from 4 to 2. (10 faculty voting members and 3 student voting members)

VOTE 17 YES 14 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Mr. John Boyd pointed out that the Library is excluded from this committee.

Another amendment was approved to include a faculty representative from the Library as a

voting member.

VOTE 18 YES 14 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Butts clarified that we are now back to the discussions of the motion to amend the proposal #3. That proposal has been amended to limit the voting to the faculty members identified, including a representative from the Library, and the students.

A motion was approved to put the new language from the amendments above into this proposal which allows for 11 faculty voting members (elected) including a Library faculty, 3 student voting members (one from the Student General Education Advisory Board and two from the SGA), and 8 non-voting ex-officio administrators.

VOTE 19 YES 14 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

The motion to approve the amended Gen Ed Proposal #3 was not voted on.

Instead, another motion was approved to appoint a subcommittee to look at the Gen Ed Proposal #3, and report back to the AP&P Committee members by Monday, November 19, 2007. (That motion puts the Gen Ed #3 proposal aside for now.)

VOTE 20 YES 13 NO 1 ABSTAIN 0

Dr. Butts asked for volunteers to serve on that subcommittee. Dr. Gayle Weitz, Dr. Allen Bryant, and Dr. Kay Taylor volunteered. Dr. Butts noted that he will get that subcommittee appointed immediately with 3-5 members in order to balance out the concerns that were address here today.

There being no further business on the October 3 agenda, the October 3 meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m. (Dr. Butts reminded the AP&P committee members to please stay because after this adjournment we will go immediately to the items on the agenda for the November 7 meeting.)

VOTE 21 YES 13 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE
October 3, 2007
Vote Record

VOTE SYMBOLS	y (YES)						N (NO)				A (ABSTAIN)	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
<hr/>												
<u>Committee Members</u>												
Jon Beebe	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N
John Boyd	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y
Allen Bryant	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y
Jeff Butts	y	-	-	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Dinesh Dave	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rodney Duke	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Mark Malloy	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Ron Marden	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y
Jon Saken	A	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	N
Kay Taylor	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Gayle Weitz	A	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	N
Erin Boyer	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N
Thomas Brigman	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	y
Kendra Johnson	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	N	N
Lindsay Tigar	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

The recommendations of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, at its October 3, 2007 meeting are incomplete at this time. The meeting recessed without adjournment at 5:20 p.m. on October 3 and it will be continued on November 7, 2007.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES COMMITTEE
October 3, 2007 (Continued on November 7, 2007)
 Vote Record

VOTE SYMBOLS	y (YES)	N (NO)	A (ABSTAIN)
	13	14	15
	16	17	18
	19	20	21

Committee Members

Jon Beebe	y	N	y	N	y	y	y	y	y
John Boyd	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	y	y
Allen Bryant	N	N	y	N	y	y	y	y	y
Jeff Butts	y	y	y	N	y	y	y	N	y
Dinesh Dave	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Rodney Duke	y	y	y	A	y	y	y	y	y
Mark Malloy	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Ron Marden	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Jon Saken	N	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Kay Taylor	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Gayle Weitz	N	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Erin Boyer	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thomas Brigman	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Kendra Johnson	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Lindsay Tigar	y	N	y	y	y	y	y	y	-

The recommendations of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee, at its October 3, 2007 and continued on November 7, 2007 are approved.

Stanley R. Aeschleman
 Stanley R. Aeschleman
 Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

11/27/07
 Date
