

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COUNCIL
Tuesday, 15 March 2016, 3 p.m.
Room 204, Bernhard Center

Members present: K. Ackerson, A. Anderson, R. Aravamuthan, J. Atkin, K. Baldner, T. Fischman, Brian Gogan (for J. Cousins), K. Hillenbrand, C. Koretsky, M. Kritzman, D. Reinhold, D. Sachs, C. Tremblay, D. Walcott

Absent without substitution: L. Coons, E. Schleis, G. Whitehurst

Guest: Rob Eversole, Chair, Professional Concerns Committee

Procedural Items

Council Chair M. Kritzman called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

Acceptance of Agenda

Anderson moved acceptance of the agenda, seconded by Ackerson. Motion carried.

Approval of the Minutes

Atkin moved approval of the minutes of 9 February 2016 as amended (Hillenbrand is chairing the committee mentioned in "Other," and there is only **one** nomination forthcoming), seconded by Tremblay. Motion carried.

Chair's Remarks

Kritzman reviewed her notes from the most recent Faculty Senate Meeting.

Information / Discussion / Action Items

1. MOA-16/03 Revised Undergraduate Program Dismissal Appeals Policy – Rob Eversole
Eversole addressed the council regarding MOA 16/03. This new language would close a "loophole" in the existing appeals policy. The changes define specific timelines and process steps for students to appeal a program dismissal. The changes close a loophole where program dismissal could be appealed, but the dismissal was based on student grades that were as a result of academic integrity sanctions. Council members proposed changes to the MOA. Eversole indicated that he was happy with these changes, and would take the proposals back to the Professional Concerns Committee. Ackerson moved to forward this MOA to the Faculty Senate, seconded by Koretsky. Motion carried.
2. Discussion of Revised MOA-15/10 Graduate and Undergraduate Catalog Revision for 5000-Level Courses
Kritzman explained that there has been a subcommittee from both USC and GSC trying to create uniform language regarding 5000-level courses

from both graduate and undergraduate catalogs. This subcommittee made a recommendation to the GSC, which they have edited and sent to USC as this MOA. The current MOA represents an essential reversal of the direction proposed by the joint subcommittee. The sense of the council was that we do not endorse this MOA.

3. Baccalaureate-Level Writing Requirement re-approval process
The council has a draft of a letter that the Committee to Oversee General Education is proposing to send out advising departments who teach Baccalaureate Level Writing courses about re-approval of these courses during the 2016-17 academic year. The council made several minor suggestions to COGE regarding the wording of this letter.
4. Committee to Oversee General Education Rubric for Area II Humanities
COGE wants written recommendations from USC for changes to this rubric. Some of these proposed changes can be found in our minutes from last month. Kritzman will write up notes from our discussion today to pass those along to COGE.
5. USC General Education Revision Feedback
We are asked for feedback to the General Education Revision MOA that had a first reading at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Kritzman suggested a number of changes she would like to see made to the proposed MOA. Kritzman will summarize our thoughts and send them to the Faculty Senate Executive Board.
6. Discussion of a Student Success Oversight Committee
The Intellectual Skills Program Advisory Subcommittee reports to this council, but we have had no communications from it in months. Kritzman explained to the chair of this subcommittee that USC was considering disbanding the committee. The chair of that subcommittee does not want to see that happen, and is now trying to reconstitute that committee. Do we also want to establish a Student Success Oversight Committee? We don't want overlapping committees, and it might be that Intellectual Skills should be merged into or seen as a part of a new Success Oversight Committee. How do we define student success? A lively discussion ensued. Kritzman would like us to think further individually about how we define student success and revisit this issue at our next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kent Baldner