

Minutes Approved

Faculty Senate, April 17, 2012

New Health Sciences Building, room 4306, 3 p.m.

Present: Ebersole, Ward-Smith, McArthur, Burnett, Wyckoff, Plamann, Taylor, Durig, Peng, Ellinghausen, McDaniels, Thiagarajan, Butner, Luppino, Sykes Berry, Alleman, Gerkovich, Krantz, Stanley, Kumar, Igwe, Bethman

Excused: Stancel, Sohraby, Madison-Cannon, Sherburn, Holt, Nickel

Absent: Gardner, Lyne, Odom, O'Brien, Hermanns

Guests: Cindy Pemberton, Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs; members of the General Education Oversight Committee: Tom Stroik, Linda Plamann, Steve Dilks

Welcome and Informational Items

This meeting is the discussion and vote on the General Education Model. Once approved, then a second motion will be discussed to enable implementation of the General Education model. The vote on that second motion will take place at the next Faculty Senate meeting on May 1st.

Approval of Agenda

The Agenda was approved by voice vote.

Approval of Minutes

Senator Wyckoff moved to approve the Minutes of April 3rd. Senator Igwe provided a second to the motion. All approved.

Provost's Remarks

Cindy Pemberton attended for Provost Hackett and she had no particular remarks to share at this time.

Motion to approve Model 2 for the General Education Curriculum: Jerry Wyckoff

After a review of the Model, questions and discussion followed.

There are three Discourse courses that will be presented as interdisciplinary and will be team taught. Each one will be a pre-requisite of the others. Pathways will be able to guide/force students to take courses in order. Some of the Platform courses can be experiential courses. Each unit can offer their own Platform courses. There will be a pool of platform courses, many if not

most of which can be existing courses that will be redesigned to fit into the General Education student learning outcomes. There will be a need for 15 new or redesigned courses by Fall 2013.

Question: Whose responsibility will it be to redesign the courses?

Response: There will be an implementation group that discusses this question but ultimately the answer to this question would be the professors. Units should have discussions about what courses could be translated, i.e., applied to the new General Education model.

Question: Would you suppose that the responsibility for providing the General Education curriculum will fall more on the faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences?

Response: We have a lot of reactions about this. Some say we should leave all this for Arts & Sciences to do. Others say this is going to kill Arts & Sciences. Some others asked whether they had to engage? Or couldn't let just let another Unit do it? My answer to those questions is that we should engage in it as faculty and select the subjects that we feel are beneficial to our students. The likelihood that Arts & Sciences will be doing much of it is because a broad range of courses already fall under Arts & Sciences and any intended interdisciplinary course outside Arts and Sciences will need to have A&S involved.

Question: Each Unit can offer their own Platform courses. In the proposed model, should each Unit accept the Platform courses of a transfer student coming from another Unit?

Response: Yes, you should accept that for General Education but that does not eliminate the students' requirements for meeting the Unit's pre-requisites.

Question: Are you imagining that students will be forced into the Anchor courses in their first semester?

Response: "Forced" is a terrible way to put it. We will try to see General Education courses fulfilled in the first 2 to 2 ½ years. We don't want students to hold onto them until their senior year.

Question: As you mentioned that new courses have to be developed, have you surveyed how many faculty are interested in developing these courses? And what is your definition of 'team-taught'?

Response: Informally I have gotten a lot of positive responses. We want to get the faculty to come to a workshop and let them discuss the ideas. I have had faculty come to me saying that they are interested in teaching a course but haven't had the opportunity to do so.

Question: In the curriculum committee that you propose, what do you see as the approval process for the new courses?

Response: The committee should be made up of people from all the units. The professor who wants to come up with a course would take a form that exists and fill out the form, make the assessment plan and submit the materials. The proposed course then goes to a Committee, yet to be established, that would review the course in light of the criteria. That's the process we are recommending right now.

Question: How will this model affect students who transfer in and out of UMKC?

Response: There are two answers to that. Transfers in with AA degrees [or more] will only take our General Education Capstone courses as they will have met the other articulation courses already in place. It is messier at the lower levels for incoming students. If the student is transferring out of UMKC then they would have met student learning outcomes.

Question: Can a different word be used instead of 'Capstone' course? The course will be confused with the Capstone courses offer in majors. This General Education Capstone is a 300 level course but in the major it is a 400 level course.

Response: We have gone through a lot of words but Capstone has probably the right meaning for what we're trying to do. 'Bridge' course was also considered.

Question: Do we create a barrier for the transfer students by requiring the Capstone course?

Response: I see it as an opportunity to provide the students with a sense of expectancy at UMKC, i.e., we can set the levels of what the students can expect in this University. It is an opportunity to create experiences by Units for their students. We have also been thinking that there needs to be some talk about how this model is a value-added inducement for the incoming students.

Question: A lot of my faculty have questions about the financial implications and the administrative structure of this model. Will the costs be under individual units or some general University body?

Response: There was no intention for us to create some administrative structure. The Discourse courses will be cross-listed and reside in their respective departments as happens now.

Question: Are the Deans of all the Units on board?

Response: All the Deans I've spoken to seem to be on-board. All the Deans from whom I have received feedback are supportive of this model. I'm doubtful about the department heads though. I expect that there might be faculty who want to participate but are told not to.

Question: Is it possible that we don't approve the model and then discuss the implementation issues and then vote for them together?

Response: No. That won't work. We need to have a plan to implement.

Senator Kumar made the motion to approve Model 2 and Senator Stanley seconded the motion. Discussion continued. This model is not set in stone as some things may have to change, can be viewed as a 'conceptual model.'

The vote was 18 Yes; 0 No; 2 Abstentions reflected their Units reservations of the models.

Discussion of the Implementation Proposals

Motion 1:

This motion is intended to create an ad hoc committee of committed faculty to work over the summer, the "Faculty Senate General Education Implementation Committee", to implement the General Education model. Recommendations from this group should be brought to the Senate by the 4th of September, 2012. A suggestion was made to include Undergraduate advisors in this group.

Motion 2:

This motion is to empower a Standing Committee to complete the implementation and oversight of the General Education curriculum.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50pm.