I. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made by, seconded by K. Wiemer, to adopt the agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Announcements

A. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by P. Braun, seconded by T. Bouril, to approve the minutes of the October 3, 2013 meeting. A correction to the wording of the CUC consent agenda is needed per G. Aase. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee

Stafstrom indicated that the first discussion revolved around a grade of C or better for KNPE 452. After much discussion it was discovered that the standard of a C or better for KNPE 452 was already required for another course so this was approved.
The second item was discussion of proficiency credit for the BSAM. Typically proficiency credit is granted by chair or curriculum committee. In this case the CUC is the curricular body for the BSAM. The relevant question brought to APASC was whether or not there should be clearly defined criteria for the awarding of proficiency credit; that motion passed.

A motion was made by J. Stafstrom, seconded by C. Lin to receive the APASC minutes from the October 2, 2013 meeting. **Motion passed unanimously.**

### B. Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

Although not present, Matuszewski reported that there was discussion about the possible reorganization of the CIUE and CUAE. That discussion is ongoing.

Another matter of old business was the review of the criteria for the Undergraduate Teaching and Instructor awards. The committee was going to review the forms electronically prior to them being disseminated across campus.

In New Business, they discussed the David Raymond funding for teaching improvement using technology. The committee will be developing a nomination form and will be responsible for selecting the recipient of the award. Kolb added that the Raymond award has been reframed. Previously it was awarded to faculty who submitted proposals for using technology in teaching for greater than 100 students. It will now be awarded to someone who has successfully implemented technology in teaching.

A motion by L. Matuszewski, seconded by C. Lin to receive the minutes of the CIUE’s Sept. 10, 2013 meeting. **Motion passed unanimously.**

### C. Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment

Lin reported that this committee also discussed the reorganization and possible merging of the CIUE and CUAE. The main concern is the resulting membership to achieve similar representation.

In new business, the committee discussed suggested topics for this year.

A motion was made by C. Lin, seconded by T. Bouril to receive the minutes of the CUAE meeting held September 10, 2013. **Motion passed unanimously.**
D. Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum

Aase mentioned that the committee’s use of VIBE is very helpful especially with the volume of materials they review.

He talked about the BSAM in Education. The proposal was well developed. The department had specific guidelines in terms of the use of proficiency credit. The model they developed for granting proficiency credit would be a good one for all programs to follow.

Aase said there were five sets of minutes in their consent agenda, which were approved without further discussion.

The college curricular minutes for discussion included COE #2 and #3 which including numerous new courses in KNPE as well as the proposed name change to the Department of Literacy to the Department of Literacy and Elementary Education. LAS #1 contained numerous course revisions and included a new track for a B.A. in English – English Studies in Writing. LAS#2 contained a couple new courses and some revisions in multiple departments. LAS#3 contained a 3+3 program for the Department of Political Science and the College of Law. It is a program that is following a national trend. The first three years focus on the undergraduate degree with the fourth year serving as degree electives and containing the first year of law coursework. This reduces the time for the two degrees from seven years down to six.

In discussing the new business items, the BSAM was once again discussed. The issue of including the A.A. and A.S. degree students was part of that discussion as well as better defining how proficiency credit is awarded. Also discussed was listing out the core requirements of which some had prerequisites and adding language to the Limited Admission/Limited Retention portion of the catalog. Stafstrom asked about the functional differences between the AA, AS and the AAS degrees. Bouril explained the AA is an Associates of Arts, which is much more social science and humanities focused. The AS is an Associates of Science, so it is more mathematics and Biology/Chemistry credits – similar to the BA and BS degrees with the focus of the coursework much the same. The AAS degree is more credits and it is to function as a degree where students complete the degree and can be employed. Computer Science is a popular degree path as is criminal justice. Aase added that it is typically considered a terminal degree. Shokrani pointed out that AAS recipients typically do not fulfill as many general education requirements as the AA or AS degrees. There was some discussion regarding perceived inequity toward students holding AA/AS degrees being allowed to participate. Aase mentioned the impact on accreditation for the College of Business. Hung pointed out that each college has their own accrediting body and more discussion on the topic is needed.
A motion to receive the October 10, 2013 minutes of the CUC was made by G. Aase, seconded by J. Kot. **Motion passed unanimously.**

E. **General Education Committee**

Kolb reported that the GEC received an update from the Task Force, which he delivered. The task force is moving forward they are disseminating surveys to faculty as well as students and he reported to the GEC about that. They also discussed the General Education assessment plan and GEC was given an opportunity to provide feedback. Kolb also talked about the change the GEC had made to the Humanities and Arts language in the catalogue. The addition of courses in this section by the College of Education lead to the language change, however it had unintended consequences. After receiving feedback from LAS & VPA, the GEC returned the language to its former content. It will seek the comments of the COE before it reconsider any language change.

Within New Business Kolb reported that as a result of the assessment plan, the GEC will follow through with digitization of the evaluation rubric for submissions and resubmissions. This will enable better documentation of the process. In addition it was discovered that there were 23 courses that were never officially approved, most in the last couple years but a few dating back as many as seven years. They also discussed cross listed courses and lastly one submission.

A motion to receive the GEC minutes from the September 26, 2013 meeting was made by C. Thompson, seconded by T. Bouril. **Motion passed unanimously.**

F. **University Honors Committee**

M. Shokrani reported that the Honors Program is undergoing a self-study and the committee met the members of the evaluation team. There was further discussion of the Honors faculty status. Summer study abroad programs were discussed. He said those included Dr. Biberick’s Montreal program. In addition he talked about a month-long program involving two universities in China, and another opportunity in Central or South America. He encouraged interested parties to contact J.D. Bowers.

A motion was made by M. Shokrani, seconded by P. Braun to receive the minutes from the September 13, 2013 meeting of the Honors committee. **Motion passed unanimously.**
IV. Other Reports

A. University Assessment Panel

Thompson gave a briefing of the job of the assessment panel. They have been working through the assessment plans of departments, typically handling one per meeting. They will also be sponsoring a workshop by an expert in assessment that will occur tomorrow. She mentioned the call for funding for assessment proposals will be out shortly.

Keddie reported on the October 18th meeting, which focused on the assessment of General Education. Another topic covered was the alumni survey which was reported to have a 30% response rate. Kolb added that he is part of the survey redesign committee and indicated that the state mandated questions, which were burdensome and intrusive, are no longer required. Smith indicated that alumni survey information is available on the assessment website.

VI Adjournment

Stafstrom made a motion, seconded by Thompson, to adjourn @ 2:11 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Ratfield
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Provost