I. Approval of the Minutes for the Meeting of April 15, 2016—Approved unanimously

II. Remarks from the Chair (Dave Pretty)

Dave Pretty welcomed everyone and members introduced themselves.

III. Remarks from the Provost and Executive Vice President (Debra Boyd)

Dr. Boyd appreciated the willingness of everyone to serve on this important group. “Conversations about language are critical although they may be painful, but we want our policies to reflect our practice. Regarding the work of this group in relationship to the strategic plan that has been unveiled, there are a number of goals that affect the academic side of the institution. What does this mean? The work you’re already doing has an impact. Faculty have already said these concepts are issues within programs. Faculty are working on this. We’re very good at ‘and’ but in terms of resources, we have a perimeter. We’ll need to do some reallocation. We will get new monies and some funds will be given to us for things we want to work on. As you are participating in conversations about these initiatives, think across colleges and divisions. How can we build across those borders? Think about ways to use our resources in new and different ways. If we are going to be good stewards of our resources, we can reach across to other departments—we don’t have to reinvent the wheel. We’ve been successful in the past of making those connections. When we talk to the legislature, they ask us how many students are in a
class. When we’re asking to do something differently, they want to know the impact. What are we getting rid of? Some programs are more expensive than others. We really do need to respect the work that we all do and understand its complexities and not make assumptions on what should or shouldn’t be done based on what our colleagues are doing in other areas. She stated that in the last staff conference Dr. Mahony answered a question regarding the feeling that other areas weren’t doing as good a job as their area. He remarked that we all bring value to the institution and the mission and we need to work together. We can do things more efficiently if we work together. She wants this body to be asking the questions or things will remain the same. Take this role seriously especially curriculum. So many things go on at here that affect academics: extra-curricular activities, workshops, in-office. Her hope is that you will take an interest in and inquire about those things that are going on as they impact the academic program. Retention is everybody’s job. It doesn’t mean we give passing grades to get students through. It means we provide support and making sure that it’s working. The strategic plan the president discussed—The metrics seem simple but relate to ten other data points that we’ll be working on. If your department chair is not talking about these, then YOU start talking about them. Let me know if you would like to serve on any working group or if you have any questions. As we discuss implementation, we have to think, ‘What comes first?’ Thank you for the work that you do. If you need anything from my office, let me know.”

Dr. Lawson, who is on the adult degree completion workgroup asked about accreditation issues as they work on degrees for adult learners. She stated that they have come up with ideas but are finding difficulty in finding information on accreditation.

Dr. Boyd said we have an Office of Assessment that can be a resource. She stressed that we should not allow the barriers to keep you from making recommendations. We bring in other expertise later.

Dr. Lawson also said she has felt limited in her discussions. Dr. Boyd mentioned this workgroup and the idea of business studies. “We can’t call it that because the College of Business is not a separate entity for AACSB to accredit them. Anything with business in the title they will question it. This particular program will not be accredited by AACSB, so it will be titled something else.” She continued, “If we think it’s a good idea (good for our students), we’ll figure out a way to do it.”

IV. New Business (Part I)

A. Proposed changes to the definition of a cultural event (Mike Lipscomb)

The Cultural Event Committee saw the policy had some ambiguous language and wanted to clean it up. They also wanted to protect the integrity of events.

1. As the language below indicates, and as established by the practiced norms of the Cultural Events Committee over the last decade, we currently require a faculty moderator to ensure “a discussion of a broad spectrum of viewpoints” as a requirement for granting cultural event status to proposed events that address potentially controversial issues. The Cultural Events Committee reached a consensus that there are often cases where qualified staff persons or administrators should be allowed to serve as moderators for these kinds of discussions. The Cultural Events Committee suggested recasting the language to read:

“A topic that relates to culture, the arts, world culture(s), or societal concerns. Topics of scientific, business, sports, or mathematical nature must show their relation to broader cultural or societal concerns. Topics in potentially controversial subject areas (such as politics and/or religion) must allow for a discussion of a broad spectrum of viewpoints. These discussions should be under faculty direction or have guidance of a faculty member or a qualified staff person with expertise in the area. The
determination of whether or not a staff member has the requisite expertise for a given event will be solely at the discretion of the Cultural Events Committee. In general, programs and performances by, or specifically designed for, children (below college age) will not be approved as cultural events. All events selected as approved cultural events should be under the sponsorship of a faculty member, administrator, or a related organization(s) (e.g., student organization, university department, etc.)."

This would enlarge the pool of people who could moderate a CE. Dr. Meeler asked if this would increase the power of committee. Dr. Lipscomb said in a way yes, that there are staff who have expertise (job, higher degree) in certain areas and would be good evidence of their ability to moderate. Dr. Parks suggested that faculty should be vetted as well. Dr. Meeler thinks this is too much power. Mr. Drueke said the committee has always had this power. The moderator is part of the event and therefore vetted by the committee.

Dr. Kedrowski noted that in her seeing multiple applications for CE’s, there is a place to denote how this meets the qualifications of a CE. Dr. Lipscomb wants to make it easier for staff to participate.

Dr. Boyd said if the goal is to broaden the number of qualified individuals, we can change the form to indicate how the person is qualified. In practice it is already done, but change the language.

Dr. Parks said he is supportive of adding staff.

A friendly amendment changed wording to read:
A topic that relates to culture, the arts, world culture(s), or societal concerns. Topics of scientific, business, sports, or mathematical nature must show their relation to broader cultural or societal concerns. Topics in potentially controversial subject areas (such as politics and/or religion) must allow for a discussion of a broad spectrum of viewpoints. These discussions should have guidance of a faculty member or a qualified staff person with demonstrable expertise in the area. The determination of whether or not a staff member has the requisite expertise for a given event will be solely at the discretion of the Cultural Events Committee. In general, programs and performances by, or specifically designed for, children (below college age) will not be approved as cultural events. All events selected as approved cultural events should be under the sponsorship of a faculty member, administrator, or a related organization(s) (e.g., student organization, university department, etc.).

The question was called and voted yes.

The motion was unanimously approved.

2. Foreign travel.
This change reflects a concern about the fairness of the current language we use to award credits for out-of-country cultural experience, and the change being suggested reflects a consensus of the Cultural Events Committee. This was confusing as it indicated that travel to one country could only get one credit. But members wanted to ensure that students who did multiple experiences could get multiple events. The committee would like the language to read:

- **Foreign travel** could include "semester abroad" experiences. One or more credits may be granted for such travel experiences or in cases where the student has visited multiple countries.

  **Please Note:** each country visited will receive one cultural event credit. If credit is being sought
simply for traveling in foreign countries, students may receive no more than one cultural event credit per country. Students, however, may seek more than one credit per country for specific cultural experiences; in such cases, the same criteria used to determine cultural event credit for experiences within the United States will be applied.

A motion to change the wording was unanimously approved.

V. Committee Reports

A. CUC (Will Thacker)

The following 3 Proposals for Program Change (Degree) were approved by CUC and can be found on the Curriculum Action System:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Conc.</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>Writ</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>DROP PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>LLAN</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>DROP PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>NEW PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Jo Koster summarized the changes in the new BA-ENGL program.

AC unanimously approved the changes.

There were eight course proposals approved by CUC which did not require action from Academic Council.

Dr. Burmeister asked about VCOM 374 not being cross-listed with ARTH 374, but there is an ARTH 349 which Dr. Burmeister said was the cross-listing. Mr. Dresbach is not here to ask. Dr. Thacker suggested she talk with him.

Dr. Thacker spoke to the justification and assessment boxes. The question, “Why are you doing this?” needs to be answered. Assessment is related to this, but it should refer to what assessment you used to trigger the desire for this change. Dr. Thacker said CUC was going to try to clean that up and make it more obvious.

B. General Education (Kristen Abernathy)

There were no courses for review at the last meeting. Dr. Abernathy spoke of the Writing Intensive Committee course application. Dr. Pretty clarified that this was just legislating what is practice. Dr. Abernathy concurred.

Academic Council approved of the new application.

C. Working Group on the GenEd Writing Requirement (Alice Burmeister)

The group has a proposal and she will send it out soon. It incorporates a lot of suggestions that came to them last year. Dr. Pretty asked what was changed. Dr. Burmeister stated that they were eliminating enumerated categories, but keeping the division between evaluated and non-evaluated writing; definition of significant writing by using a percentage (30%); and consequences for not
VI. Remarks from Council of Student Leaders Chair (Elisabeth “Beth” West)
Miss West stated that course evaluations are not required when a student drops a course. She said there was a big source of data missing from this. Dr. Koster said this was interesting and stated there are studies that show evaluations are not helpful or accurate as they tend to be biased toward gender or personality of instructor. You are right to raise the question, but the evaluation of teaching is a bit iffy. Dr. Abernathy commented that students who drop don’t get all the info from the class, so that evaluation wouldn’t be accurate. She also remarked that the math department does survey students who leave the major.
Mr. Drueke said he could talk with deans regarding an online survey.

Dr. Bird mentioned that students don’t have to get signatures for withdrawing, so we miss that information.

Dr. Lawson said she agreed we are missing data. We already muddy the evaluation process and questions how we would implement. She asked, “What’s the easiest way to get the data?”

Dr. Parks suggested a new field on the drop/add screen. Ms. Jones said that would have to be a few years out as we upgrade the current software.

Several members said that online course evaluations were down.

Miss West also questioned the pre-req for MATH 150 and 151 in that they are different between fall/spring and summer. Dr. Abernathy addressed this. This has to do with placement test scores and the student’s major.

VII. Old Business
None

VIII. New Business (Part II)
Dr. Koster asked the Cultural Event committee to modify the Cultural Event request form to state the qualifications of the moderator.

The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Thacker referenced the Intensive Writing form and the need for a signature and suggested that WU develop an electronic signature. We could save money and time by doing this. He made a proposal to come up with a global way to do Electronic Signatures.

This was unanimously approved by the members.

IX. Announcements
Dr. Bird reminded the Council that Faculty Conference meets a week from today in Carroll Hall.
Ms. Jones reminded the Council of Interim grading coming up.

X. Adjournment
Dr. Pretty adjourned the meeting at 3:56 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gina Jones, Secretary