

University Undergraduate Academic Council
January 20, 2016
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Adams Center Conference Room

Present: V. McCracken, S. Lewis, S. Stewart, C. Pruett, S. Wages, S. Jones, C. Bacon, V. Williams

Absent: I. Shepherd, G. Powell

Ex-officios: W. Paris, E. Gumm, P. Vardiman, B. Fang, (J. Weaver was not present)

Guests: Greg Straughn, Lynette Sharp-Penya, Ron Morgan, Tom Milholland

The meeting began at 3:35 p.m.

- I. Call to order by S. Lewis.
- II. Prayer by Steve Wages.
- III. Approval of the minutes from 12.2.15

Motion to approve the minutes by S. Jones; seconded by S. Stewart; 6 in favor; 1 abstention; motion passes.

Action Items:

- IV. Historical Literacy Criteria

S. Lewis - If this passes today we will be able to communicate to departments so they can start submitting courses for consideration for the new Historical Literacies menu. We would like to have the bulk of courses presented this spring for inclusion in the fall. Please refer to the Historical Literacies Outcomes document and note that it passed with UGEC approval.

R. Morgan – We formed a committee and came up with the 4 outcomes you can see on the document, moving from broad to more specific skills. We don't want students to only view history as academic and confined to the classroom, but vibrant in nature. We decided not to continue having a continually acting committee to judge courses by the criteria since there is not a similar committee for any of the other general education menus. The UGEC will manage the approval process.

V McCracken – Question about process. We are voting strictly on outcomes, not specific courses, correct? S. Lewis – Correct. V. McCracken – Are all departments open to submit courses for inclusion on the menu? R. Morgan – Yes, it is open to all departments. For general education courses there are certain criteria the course must

meet in addition to our specific outcomes, including a lower division number, no pre-requisites, and being broadly open to numerous students and majors. V. Williams – We are recognizing that other departments have historical strengths, but we have strict criteria to ensure that not just any course will be accepted for this menu. There needs to be a rigorous consideration of the historical components. The committee that came up with these outcomes crosses many departmental lines. We're hoping this opens up an opportunity for our students to leave here with certain understandings about the world around them and how events influence the world. V. McCracken – I agree. We need high quality choices on this menu.

S. Lewis – So for process, it doesn't need to go through the individual college councils. G. Straughn – A strict reading of the approval chart states that college councils need to approve these items before moving on to UGEC and UUAC. S. Lewis – It was my understanding that the college council didn't want to review them all. Lynette S. Peña – We don't feel like the college council needs to approve, but the approval chart remains unchanged, so we feel like we must

T. Milholland – I'd like to make a Statement – The term student learning outcomes can be misleading when some of these describe specific activities. I might pick on #3 – the discussion could happen at any time. We need to have a way to assess these outcomes to demonstrate student proficiency. S. Lewis – Other documents use the term *criteria*. C. Bacon – Can we just change the language to criteria so that the language is consistent across general education menu documents?

C. Bacon – I move that we approve these outcomes with the change of the language from *outcome* to *criteria*. Remove *outcome* from before the list – Then say, "The courses must meet the following criteria:" Also change the title of document to reflect criteria. V. Williams seconds. R. Morgan will send the edited document.

Motion to approve by C. Bacon with a few edits; seconded by V. Williams; 7 in favor; motion passes.

E. Gumm – We do have criteria for all of our general education menus, and we have the understanding that achievement of student outcomes will be assessed, but we don't have a good method of reporting that assessment. UGEC will be trying to add a new assessment piece and make it consistent across all of the general education menus. This will help with SACS as well. S. Lewis – You talked about a template for capturing that assessment piece. L. Sharp-Peña – There is also that assessment chart. There are a number of chairs in CAS that have been assessing outcomes based on this chart. Reporting on inquiry and knowledge for these courses.

V. Closing Patty Hanks Shelton School of Nursing Courses

S. Lewis – Our relationship with the PHSSN has ended; therefore, it is probably time to close the courses associated with that program.

Motion to approve by S. Stewart; seconded by C. Pruett; all in favor; motion passes.

S. Lewis - Do we have other agenda items?

G. Straughn – We would like to propose that a change be made to the approval chart, item #3 on page 2, amending the college council slot from an A to an I or dash leaving approval to UGEC and UUAC. You could even dash out everything before UGEC. S. Stewart – I would want department approval to remain, so a rogue faculty member doesn't bring a course without departmental approval first.

S. Lewis – So the chart should read A - - and leave the rest – Departments should still have to approve but not the college council or dean. L. Sharp-Penya - The reason why we wanted to change this is because the UGEC knows the criteria best, they should have the most say. As a college council, we don't know how rigorous another college council might be when sending proposals through. It seems fairer for UGEC to vet the courses more consistently. The college council members don't feel comfortable interpreting the criteria. G. Straughn – That's the charge of the UGEC. Another council should not be tasked with that when it is the function of UGEC. V. Williams – It makes sense to make this change. It regularizes the process. T. Milholland – Could a dean still send a letter of recommendation? S. Lewis – Yes.

S. Lewis – The proposal as I understand it is to change #3 on page 2 for university requirements menu – Change College Academic Council to dash – and Dean to dash – leave everything else the same.

Motion to approve by C. Bacon; seconded by V. Williams; all in favor; motion passes.

Meeting ended at 4:12 p.m.