

## Academic Council Minutes August 22, 2014

Abbigail Armstrong	Education
Adolphus Belk	Arts and Sciences
Judy Brit	Education
Janice Chism, Chair	Arts and Sciences
Ian Deas	CSL Student Representative
Tomoko Deguchi	Visual & Performing Arts
Marguerite Doman	Business Administration
Laura Glasscock	Arts and Sciences
Lisa Harris	Education
Trent Kull*	Arts and Sciences
Stephanie Lawson	Business Administration
David Meeler	Arts and Sciences
Marge Moody	Visual & Performing Arts
Ron Parks	Visual & Performing Arts
Dave Pretty	Arts and Sciences
Spiro Shetuni	Dacus Library
Will Thacker	Business Administration
Ginger Williams	Arts and Sciences
Gina Jones, Secretary	Registrar

\*absent

Guests: Dan Gordon, Karen Kedrowski, Tim Drueke, and Andrew Vorder-Bruegge

### I. Welcome

**Janice Chism, Chair**

Dr. Chism brought the meeting to order at 2:01 PM.

She indicated that she had just met with Dr. Debra Boyd on Wednesday, thus the delay in getting the agenda out. She then introduced herself and asked everyone else to introduce themselves.

### II. Approval of minutes from April 18, 2014

Unanimous approval.

### III. Comments from Acting President and Provost

**Debra Boyd**

Dr. Boyd was unable to attend.

### IV. Committee Reports

#### A. CUC

**Will Thacker**

Dr. Thacker passed out templates to assist departments in revamping their programs with new the Gen Ed requirements. He anticipates that CUC will be looking at a lot of programs this year and this template will facilitate the process.

Template #1 represents what was approved last April in faculty conference. The goal is to keep the Gen Ed program as flexible as possible. The rule is that a major cannot prescribe more than two courses in the Gen Ed program unless accreditation or certification mandates it. CUC will want to see from the departments what those accreditations or certifications are.

Dr. Thacker asked everyone to look over the templates and see if there are any improvements. He would like to send this out to departments by Wednesday. This is confusing and some programs may have to go through two curriculum cycles.

Dr. Karen Kedrowski asked how this relates to the curriculum system. Ms. Jones explained that they can just do a copy and paste into the word document that is already there.

Dr. Meeler indicated that his department would like to put “may be met where applicable” but warn the student that only two can be used. Dr. Thacker said a bold footnote would be needed next to the statement.

Dr. Deguchi asked “How do students know which course is meeting what Gen Ed if it meets more than one? “

Dr. Vorder-Bruegge noted that DegreeWorks applies its own logic, and that he understood that this didn't apply to every Gen Ed. Dr. Thacker said that yes, some Gen Ed courses specifically can be met by the major and that the Constitution requirement can be double-counted.

Dr. Gordon asked about the physical activity. Dr. Thacker said we have no criteria for this yet, but the Gen Ed committee will be tasked with this.

Dr. Pretty asked if we should list all history courses that meet a Gen Ed. Dr. Thacker answered, “No, just list one.”

He also reminded everyone that AP courses can fulfill Gen Ed.

Dr. Chism indicated that she foresees issues downstream. We are trying to open this up for students, but listing one course may be the same problem.

Dr. Thacker said he is available for consultation.

#### ***B. General Education Committee***

***Laura Glasscock***

Dr. Glasscock reminded everyone of the courses that need recertified: 200- level Historical Perspectives, Social Science, Humanities and Arts, Natural Science, and the Constitution Requirement. She gave deadlines for submitting courses to the Gen Ed committee.

#### **V. Remarks from the Council of Student Leaders Chair**

**Ian Deas**

Mr. Deas relayed that he has heard positive feedback from students regarding the S/U deadline.

The Council of Student Leaders is having a town hall meeting September 8 to see what student needs are in order to create a vision. Academic integrity is on the agenda. He is looking forward to being a support system for Academic Council on this matter.

## **VI. Old Business**

### ***Academic integrity***

***Adolphus Belk***

Dr. Belk's group had some recommendations last year. He remarked that his group was charged to get the conversation going. They would like to see an honor code or honor pledge. They are not married to the words, but it is something for this body to see if we want to go forward.

Dr. Chism noted that we need the student point of view.

Dr. Belk indicated we need a web page to be the one place for information. We can get feedback from students on what they need to see.

Dr. Chism asked if we need a joint Taskforce. How should we proceed?

Ms. Moody asked if Dr. Chism wants the subgroup committee to come back with something to take to the students. Some members have rotated off Academic Council. There are other members in student affairs and athletics.

Dr. Vorder-Bruegge asked if the committee dealt with the charges. The answer was, "No."

Ms. Moody inquired if it would be more productive if the subgroup worked on this.

Dr. Chism stated that this is a major activity for this year, and we should put in place a mechanism for doing it. We can explore the idea with students about what they would want on the website.

Dr. Belk noted UVA website and how concise it was.

Ms. Moody said she doesn't have a feel for what an honor code would look like.

Dr. Vorder-Bruegge asked, "How is this different from the Dedication to Excellence?"

Dr. Thacker indicated that the difference is that this is a pledge students would put on their work. It would become a daily thing.

Ms. Moody stated the committee didn't discuss how it would be implemented. There was some discomfort that this may be overbearing for faculty.

Dr. Belk remarked that there is no routine currently. It's about getting it inculcated into daily student lives.

Dr. Williams mentioned that she uses the blue book in exams which has an academic integrity statement. It is too long and we need something shorter.

Dr. Chism asked, "Where would we like to get to today? Do we want to ask the subgroup to continue to work on this? To partner with students? To work on honor code and web page?"

Dr. Deguchi stated we should do what we can to keep students honest, but we do need to ask them how to go about this.

There was a motion to reconvene the subcommittee to further work on the issue. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Parks stated he hoped to find out what works well now, what is broken, and put forward solutions.

Dr. Belk noted that one of the things he knows about misconduct is that we need to communicate with each other. On the student end, he often hears "I didn't know I couldn't do that". A website would help with this. "I don't know" is not sufficient.

Dr. Meeler said that the Dean of Students keeps files on students who have been reported cheating. She does not notify everyone because of FERPA.

Dr. Belk informed the council that his department [Political Science] now sends her everything.

## **VII. New Business**

Dr. Chism asked if there was anything else we should take up this year?

Dr. Williams mentioned that the faculty were concerned how faculty raises affect course delivery.

Dr. Parks said he was not sure what was under our jurisdiction.

Dr. Thacker stated he thought this might be under the Faculty Concerns Committee.

Dr. Chism agreed that there is a grey area, but if this affects academics, it may be something to talk about.

Dr. Belk questioned if this is the place to discuss faculty disappointment with compensation and their performance in course delivery. He said we were all asked to do more with less pay. He then talked about watching his parents do hard physical labor and it shaped his work ethic. While he shares their concerns, we have to do what we were hired to do.

Mr. Drueke read from the faculty manual about what AC is responsible for. He said while it is an interesting topic, it is beyond this council's purview. Perhaps university priorities would be a better venue.

Dr. Parks indicated that morale has been hurt. We need to be careful how we approach this, though.

Dr. Chism said that each of us should take this to heart and think of ways this may hurt academic programs.

Dr. Parks suggested that faculty may be less inclined to create new courses.

Dr. Chism the talked about other items for consideration this year:

1. She will set up a working group to create criteria for the inclusion of a course as an activity requirement.
2. There will also be a working group to review criteria for the quantitative requirement.
3. We will also review the technology requirement. It's clear that we need to look at what we expect students to be able to do.
4. In the spring, a new taskforce will be appointed to review the Gen Ed core: WRIT 101, HMXP 102, and CRTW 201.
5. There will be a timetable for cycle of review of other Gen Ed requirements. The idea is that this is not a one and done thing--that we should look at everything every few years.

Dr. Pretty stated that we need to look at the oral requirement, too, especially since departments are encouraged to develop a course for their majors.

Dr. Meeler asked, "Not every goal has to be pursued this year, right?"

Dr. Pretty commented that we need to start talking about it now.

Dr. Chism clarified that he wanted this to be moved up in priority. She agreed this made sense.

#### **VIII. Announcements.**

There were no announcements.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Gina Jones, Secretary