

UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Unapproved Minutes

October 24, 2017

Present: Jamie White-Farnham (WLS, Chair); Kenna Bolton Holz (HBJD); Amanda Zbacnik (EDL); Monica Roth Day (Academic Affairs); Peter Cook (Natural Sci); Erin Aldridge (Music); Edie Wasylyszyn (SBE); Chad Vollrath (Comm Arts); Jeff Kirschling (Registrar); Olawole Famule (Visual Arts); Janie Campbell (Registrar's Office); Tom Tu (CETL); Jim Geidner (HHP); Wendy Kropid (WLLC); Eric Edwards (SI, Secretary)

Unrepresented: MCS

Guests: N/A

The meeting of the University Undergraduate Academic Affairs Council was called to order at 2:34 p.m. by chairperson Jamie White-Farnham, in Swenson 3004.

Move to approve agenda (Edie/Amanda). Approved.

Motion to approve October 10, 2017 minutes (Peter/Erin). Approved.

Reports

- Chair: Add nomination for Chair Pro Tempore to next agenda.
- Secretary: No report.
- University Studies: Charges handed down from Senate – scheduling model for university studies categories is one.
- Registrar: No report.
- Dean of Academic Affairs: No report.

Items for Discussion/Information

Discussion:

1. UAAC Bylaws

- Jamie: We don't have to accept the bylaws today, but opening it up for questions and suggestions. Most changes are formatting related.
- Amanda – student membership. Are we supposed to have a student here?
- Monica – I haven't seen a student consistently attend – or even attend once. Not just in UAAC, but in all committees.
- Jim – does chair attend senate executive committees? Jamie – not current practice.
- Peter – how are we interfacing with Senate? Jamie – email correspondence. Wendy – there are already a lot of responsibilities for chair, plus the meetings are not scheduled conveniently.
- Monica – Dean of Faculties should be changed to Dean of Academic Affairs
- Jamie – we will put it on the agenda for our next meeting.

Noted as received:

1. SI – Minor course title/description change: HIST 119

Items up for a Vote

1. SI – new course: SOCI/ANTH 414 – Sociology of Superior, Wisconsin

- Motion to approve: Eric/Jim
- Motion approved unanimously.

2. SI – new course: POLS 240 – Bioterrorism and Public Policy

- Motion: Jim/Amanda.
- Jeff K – where is the position description? Eric: will check with Alisa for description
- Motion approved unanimously

3. Tabled from 10/10/17: Consider the appropriateness of developing a policy based on the following recommendation: develop a procedural plan to evaluate whether international and/or military veterans who were stationed abroad meet the learning outcomes within the Diversity and/or Global Awareness University Studies categories.

- Jamie: motion is to **move to develop a policy and procedure to evaluate students seeking to satisfy the requirement for Diversity and Global Awareness categories** (Jamie/Kenna)
- Note: international and veteran students have been removed from the original faculty senate charge given to UAAC.
- Monica – we need to provide clear process for prior learning process. This is what Senate interpreted from the GPSS document. We already have a procedure for prior learning. Julie Gard is developing a procedure for this.
- Jamie – the sticking process is that credit for prior learning is for a course, not a category
- Wendy – is there a rubric associated with these categories?
- Kenna – who is going to evaluate what the student produces and where it falls on the rubric?
- Monica – if it's a course sub, they get the credit. If it's a category, though, they meet the category but not the credit.
- Kenna – are we the best people to come up with this policy?
- Wendy – it's an academic policy, so it should be done here.
- Peter – is the motivation of our university studies curriculum to check off boxes for students, then this makes sense. If the motivation is student growth, even if they've had some diversity/GA experience in the class, the goal is to push them further. Factory vs. garden type model.
- Wendy – is this something we want students to have while we're here, or is it an experience we want them to have while they're here?
- Jim – purpose of US core is to create a common experience for students. Creating a campus culture.
- Monica – this would be a major shift. We accept transfer students with AA degrees who may or may not have the same sort of diversity/GA experience as students who start here.
- Kenna – having a procedure makes sense given our current USP. If we want loftier goals, we need to change USP.
- Wole – problem – students learn better if they come from different culture – will not be able to share their knowledge with the class
- Chad – said something similar to Wole's statement last meeting.

- Monica – if it's about diversity in the classroom, that's a different discussion than this. There are a very small number who do Credit for Prior Learning. This may open the door, but they still have to do the CPL process.
- Kenna – most students will find it more efficient to just take the classes.
- Jamie – we're setting a precedent, we don't know exactly what it will look like
- Chad – are we drawing a distinction between prior experience and prior learning?
- Peter – would feel a lot more comfortable voting for this if we had more specification about who is coming up with the policy.
- Jamie – Senate did it this way in order to take the process slowly.
- Jim – it's a weird request – on that basis alone, I would vote against it.
- Jamie – we've amended the request based on what we feel is appropriate
- Wendy – friendly amendment – policy and procedure
- Peter – for CPL, when a student does that, does it have to be for a particular course we have on campus? Jeff – yes.
- Wendy – is there wordsmithing needed here? Are we okay that we're waiving the requirement, or are we saying that they're satisfying it in a different way?
- Janie – the documents say waiving.
- Monica – the term used is waive.
- Kenna – satisfy is better language.
- Jim – we should send this back to senate.
- Wendy – Senate will send this back when they request policy creation.
- Wole – would this be cost effective on the part of the student? Wendy – it could possibly.
- **Vote: 3 in favor, 4 oppose, 4 abstain. Motion fails.**
- Jim – might be helpful to have a conversation with Senate – someone should develop a policy to vote on.
- Wendy – vote reflects that we might be able to consider a policy.

Adjourned 3:15 pm.

Next meeting: November 7, 2017