SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING   3/24/08

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:17 P.M.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 02/11/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker shared that the Middle Eastern Association sent six American university presidents and provosts to the United Arab Emirates over spring break, of which he was a part. They were able to study close up K-16 educational systems in Dubai, Abu Dhabi and Sharjah, and that the educational system in the United Arab Emirates is looking at ways to bring the American and United Arab Emirates together in terms of education.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari updated the Senate on the Provost search, noting the committee has evaluated feedback from the campus community as well as their own evaluations, and they met with President Allen during spring break to pass along their information and recommendations.

The Academic Advising Council will be doing a survey of advisors on campus in April and will also be adding some language to the Academic Advising section in the UNI catalogue to better alert students to the mission and goals of Academic Advising.

There were some faculty concerns over assessments at the recent Town Hall meeting, and if senators or their colleagues have concerns they should forward them to himself or Associate Provost Kopper.

Chair Licari noted that UNI had an incident recently where the new UNI Alert System was activated and he has heard a lot of concern and confusion from faculty about what to do when their class is in session, what to do if their class is about to meet, and things like that.

Chair Licari also noted that there is also an issue related to communications. Last year the UNI Faculty Senate endorsed a policy that was brought forward by the Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG) stating that students would not have access to their electronic devices, such as cell phones, during class time. Cell phones are one of the key communication devices being used to get the UNI alerts out to everyone and this presents a conflict. Jim O'Connor, Associate Director Public Relations, UNI Marketing and Public Relations, and David Zarifis, Director, UNI Public Safety, and Jan Hanish, Assistant View President Outreach and Special Programs/Vice President for Administration and Finance were present to discuss this with the Senate.

They reviewed the incident that happened on the UNI Campus March 11 and noted that there was a great deal of response and concern from faculty on this. They are working on ways to improve how these alerts are handled, specifically in the classroom, and how to improve communications during these alerts, noting that situations will often be a determining factor. They reviewed some of the possible measures UNI could take and asked the faculty for their input, noting that this will be a system that will be continually evolving as technology evolves. A lengthy discussion followed.

Chair Licari stated that UNI will be purchasing and will put into place a new Student Information System. This is an important new update to our system, which has been in use since approximately 1982 and it's time that it be replaced with something more modern. However this will be a big project. Vice-President for Educational and Student Services, Terry Hogan, is here today to provide the Senate with information on this. Dr. Hogan is in charge of this project along with Jan Hanish.

What UNI currently has is a Student Information System that functions, but it has been created and revised by UNI staff over the last 20 years a piece at a time. The core of this existing system comes from a vendor that is no longer in business, which

means we no longer have a vendor updating the technology that they sold us, nor are they supporting it. It's not a crisis today but it's clear that's this system will not be sustainable.

Dr. Hogan distributed informational sheets and reviewed them with the Senate, noting some of the background and rationale for this update. This is the information service that includes everything from course registration, developing a class list, grade reports and transcripts, dropping and adding classes, maintaining information about student's academic advisors, and beyond. The goals for this project is for UNI to transition to a new system that will improve efficiency, and increase the effectiveness of critical processes that rely on this data. Many institutions have already transitioned to new web-interfaced systems that are more user friendly and will ultimately allow use of this technology to support academic programs for generations. Project goals, guiding principles on how they want to approach this project and project phases were reviewed. Some activities are currently underway to begin to involve the campus community in helping to define what is needed out of this new potentiality. The goals for this project is for UNI to able to transition to a new system that will improve efficiency, and increase the effectiveness of critical processes that rely on this data. A lengthy discussion followed.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Faculty Chair Simet had no comments today.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

955 CSBS Faculty Senate Resolution – Liberal Arts Core
     Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #863 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

956 Liberal Arts Core Committee 2006-2007 Annual Report

Motion to docket in regular order as item #864 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

957 Capstone Management Guidelines

Chair Licari noted that this came with a recommendation from Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, to be docketed out of regular order to be discussed at today's meeting.

Motion to docket out of regular order at the head of the docket as item #865 by Senator Basom; second by Senator O'Kane.

Motion passed with 4 opposed.

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, noted that the document outlines the rules that the LACC have been operating under previously and the added things that need to be considered are due to the fact that Capstone is now something that is university wide, not just in one college. Things such as clarifying how to manage and maintain it, how to assess it and providing some detailed and specific rules in some cases are needed. Catalog changes are also to be considered. If there are concerns she would like to know.

Associate Provost Kopper brought forth information from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), noting that they did not discuss the entire Capstone Management document but they did discuss the numbering issue because of the significance to the UNI catalogue. She shared with the Senate what the UCC discussed and their recommendation. A lengthy discussion followed.

Revised motion by Senator Basom to accept Section III of the Capstone Management Guidelines; second by Senator Soneson.

Discussion followed.

Senator Basom modified her motion that was previously modified to replace the 010: Capstone prefix with CAP: in Section III of the Capstone Management Guidelines; second by Senator Soneson.

Discussion followed.

Revised motion by Senator Basom to accept Section III of the Capstone Management Guidelines was approved.

The Senate voted to approve Senator Basom's second amended motion on Section III of the Capstone Management Guidelines which was to replace the 010: Capstone prefix with CAP: in

Section III of the Capstone Management Guideline. Motion passed.

Motion to docket in regular order the remainder of the Capstone Management Guidelines by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Basom. Motion passed.

958 Dropped Certificate Program in Long Term Care

Motion to docket in regular order as item #866 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East.

Friendly amendment to docket out of regular order at the head of the docket as item #866 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the dropping of this certificate program by Senator East; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

959 Update to LAC Guidelines – Subcategory 4B

Motion to docket in regular order by Senator East; second by Senator Funderburk.

Amended motion to docket out of regular order at the head of the docket as item #867 by Senator East; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Update to the LAC Guidelines by Senator O'Kane; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglass. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Faculty Chair Simet stated that he has information about the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence, which need to be discussed in Executive Session.

Motion to go into Executive Session by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the list of candidates for the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Van Wormer. Motion passed.

Chair Licari called for a motion to re-establish the nomination materials for the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence.

Motion by Senator Soneson by use the second list for the nomination materials for the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed with two opposed.

ADJOURNMENT

DRAFT FOR SENATOR'S REVIEW

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MEETING
3/24/08
1658

PRESENT: Maria Basom, Gregory Bruess, Phil East, Jeffrey Funderburk, Mary Guenther, Bev Kopper, Michael Licari, James Lubker, David Marchesani, Pierre-Damien Mvuyekure, Chris Neuhaus, Steve O'Kane, Phil Patton, Donna Schumacher-Douglas, Ira Simet, Jerry Smith, Jerry Soneson, Katherine van Wormer

Ben Schafer was attending for Paul Gray.

Absent: David Christensen, Susan Wurtz, Michele Yehieli

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Licari called the meeting to order at 3:17 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of the 02/11/08 meeting by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

CALL FOR PRESS IDENTIFICATION

No press present.

COMMENTS FROM INTERIM PROVOST LUBKER

Interim Provost Lubker shared that the Middle Eastern Association sent six American university presidents and provosts to the United Arab Emirates over spring break, of which he was a part. They were able to study close up K-16 educational systems in Dubai, Abu Dhabi and Sharjah, and it was a pretty impressive trip. He will be getting information to the Faculty Senate on faculty and student exchanges that might be considered. The educational system in the United Arab Emirates is looking at a ways to bring the American and United Arab Emirates together in terms of education. The United Arab Emirates is very concerned with improving K-12 education and are ready to move on this, and he has found that when they are ready to move on something, they move big time.

COMMENTS FROM CHAIR, MICHAEL LICARI

Chair Licari updated the Senate on the Provost search, noting the committee met Friday, March 14 to evaluate feedback from the campus community on the candidates that were invited for campus visits as well as the evaluations from the committee. The committee met with President Allen during spring break to pass along their information and recommendations.

The Academic Advising Council, which he chairs and is currently meeting every other week, has representatives from each college as well as other elements of Academic Affairs represented. They will be doing a survey of advisors on campus in April. They will also be adding some language to the Academic Advising section in the UNI catalogue to better alert students to the mission and goals of Academic Advising. Currently the statement in the catalogue is not very accommodating in terms of helping students understand what they can get out of Academic Advising.

Chair Licari stated that there were some faculty concerns over assessments at the recent Town Hall meeting when it was all introduced and with how it fits in with accreditation. If senators or their colleagues have concerns they should forward them to himself or Associate Provost Kopper.

Chair Licari noted that UNI had an incident recently where the new UNI Alert System was activated and faculty should have received phone calls, emails, and/or text messages on this. Immediately after that incident he began to hear a lot of concern and confusion from faculty about what to do when their class is in session, what to do if their class is about to meet, and things like that.

Chair Licari also noted that there is also an issue related to communications. Last year the UNI Faculty Senate endorsed a policy that was brought forward by the Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG). The policy was that students would not have access to their electronic devices, such as cell phones, during class time. Cell phones are one of the key communication devices being used to get the UNI alerts out to everyone and this presents a conflict. To discuss this at today's meeting were Jim O'Connor, Associate Director Public Relations, UNI Marketing and Public Relations, David Zarifis, Director, UNI Public Safety, and Jan Hanish, Assistant View President Outreach and Special Programs/Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Mr. O'Connor thanked the Senate for their feedback on the recent incident. He noted that the world has changed quite a bit in a very short time and a year ago cell phones in classrooms were a nuisance. Since the incident last April at Virginia Tech that nuisance has become a necessity. The outcry from parents and other concerned people is they want universities and colleges to do their very best to speak person to person rather than general broad based announcements, which is what technology had allowed us to do in the past. With changes in technology and the sense of urgency, one of the things universities have been required to do by the constituency of parents and other concerned people is come up with ways to better communicate directly to people. One of those venues is cell phones, with both voice and text messages. The system that UNI uses, also in common with Iowa State and the University of Iowa, is ConnectEd with text messaging and voice messaging service. Those that were teaching classes the night of March 11 are well aware of the fact that messages went out with some classes receiving the message and some not, depending on the requirements of the professors in those classes. There was great response from UNI professors asking how they should handle this intrusion in their classes, as well as the ability to get messages during class.

One of the main questions everyone has, stated Mr. O'Connor, is "what do we do?" They have some general ideas but would like input from the faculty on this. The classroom setting is special, different, and there are special needs that faculty have depending on the time of day, depending on location.

Mr. O'Connor continued that in looking back at the event on March 11, the closest thing we have had like it that we all are accustomed to is a tornado warning; something very bad that

potentially could happen but hasn't happened yet but you need to be ready because you may need to take action immediately. That was pretty much the situation UNI was in on March 11. In looking ahead, the question is how to help the faculty communicate to other faculty and students on campus in the event we have a situation with someone actively shooting on campus or there is that threat. What are the best practices people should follow?

Senator Van Wormer suggested a siren going off that would alert people so they could turn on their cell phones.

Mr. Zarifis commented that the university's emergency messaging system is not yet complete and that they have a voice automated system via sirens capability that they are currently looking into. This will allow them real-time voice messaging which will address some of the issues and concerns that they face now in terms of providing quicker information about the situation. This will also consist of a pre-set signal for emergency weather that could be utilized. This will compliment the system that is currently in place. Noting that in emergencies such as this, everyone's circumstance is different, where they are located, where the active situation is located. They also plan to put together templates addressing the various circumstances faculty and students may have. What they are asking from the Faculty Senate is what kind of format and planning could best be presented to faculty and staff in terms of the information received, what can be provided, and how additional information can be supplied.

Mr. Zarifis noted that they are willing to do any kind of workshops or planning sessions that faculty would like. Most importantly, they are looking for input from faculty as to what they would like.

Senator O'Kane stated that he's curious about how we could go about having live cell phones in the classroom without the constant interruptions and guarding against the real possibility of cheating?

Mr. O'Connor responded that it's a tremendous question that they don't yet have an answer for. Steve Moon, Interim Associate Vice President, ITS Administration, suggested the simple response of putting a hard line phone in every classroom. In looking at safety there are no absolutes but we also have to look at short-term and long-term realities of budgets and it would be a consider expense for the university. The key

question is to look at this with an open mind. The goal is to get information to people immediately and let them knew that there is a very serious situation, what the situation is and what they should do to respond to that situation. Currently they know that it can be done via cell phones, however cell phones are a huge nuisance. Locker rooms with signs prohibiting the use of cell phones are towards cell phones with built in cameras. In classrooms there's potential problems with cell phones with camera, phones ringing and disrupting class, and students texting.

Mr. O'Connor continued, stating that within the state of Iowa there have been three alerts at the three state university campuses within a week and a half and they were all legitimate. That's a frightening statistic and the unfortunate reality in the world today right here in Iowa is that we're seeing these sorts of threats at a growing rapid pace.

Jan Hanish, Assistant View President Outreach and Special Programs/Vice President for Administration and Finance, stated that they are continuing to look for the best practices from other universities because we're not the only university concerned with this. One thing that has come forward is the question of students being required to keep anything electronic turned to silent in the classroom. On March 11 if you were around anyone whose cell phone was not turned to silent, you knew pretty quickly that there was something different because phones started all going off. It is a very different thing than a student getting a phone call. It would be a very different dynamic.

The other option, Dr. Hanish continued, would be that the instructor is the only one in a classroom with a cell phone. Cell phones that are programmed with caller id will show "UNI Alert" when an alert is issued, and you know immediately who it's from. This puts some ownership on the person at the front of the classroom. How comfortable he or she is at doing this, and what to do with the information once they get it both remain to be worked out. They are hoping that faculty who talk with friends and colleagues all across the nation will be able to find out what has worked at other universities and to pass that information on. They would like to have this system as a "best practices" kind of thing to share with faculty so they aren't wondering.

Mr. Zarifis noted that there are some things that they are looking at with the outdoor speaker system. There are products

that can be utilized whereby once you initiate alert system speakers that have been strategically placed they can also provide the same information that is sent out electronically in real time. The real time aspect is one of their priorities, which would be very helpful to give specific information. With the incident on March 11, there was a specific location, a specific target, with a specific suspect, which is why when the information came out Dancer Hall was specifically noted. As they were working with a cell phone, they weren't sure where the person was which also added to the question in this specific instance.

Mr. O'Connor also added that when these things happen they are evolving and solutions need to be reached, as there is a sense of urgency. And while we hope that it never happens here again we do need to be prepared. Looking at both short-term and long-term, what device can we give the people that are teaching? And nighttime versus daytime are different. During the day, in most classroom buildings this alert would go out with the main offices receiving it almost immediately and they can then spread the word throughout the classrooms. What happened on March 11 is a best-case/worst-case scenario; it was night classes and there were no people in the main offices. As technology evolves the guidelines will also evolve so we need to have an outline to follow but not be rigid because things will evolve and change as we go along, and hopefully get better and better.

Mr. Zarifis added that with text messages they have a limited space that they can provide this information in. How the messages is crafted is very, very important because everyone takes out of it what they want, which is why they are working with templates to try to provide clear and concise information.

Chair Licari thanked Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Zarifis and Dr. Hanish for their input and suggested that the Senate re-visit the Electronic Devices policy that was discussed last year to see if there are some changes that could be made in light the new UNI Alert System.

Chair Licari stated that UNI will be purchasing and will put into place a new Student Information System. He noted that he is the Academic Affairs representative on the Executive Steering committee for this project. It is an important new update to our system, which has been in use since approximately 1982. It is time that it be replaced with something more modern and this will be a big project. Vice-President for Educational and

Student Services, Terry Hogan, is present to provide the Senate with information on this. Dr. Hogan is in charge of this project along with Jan Hanish.

Dr. Hogan distributed an informational sheet to the Senate. He thanked Chair Licari for his willingness to serve on this project and noted that there are individuals from all across campus serving on this project.

In describing UNI's current state of affairs, Dr. Hogan stated that one might have one of those old black rotary phones, which would still work if plugged in, however it would not be able to maximize the potential telephonic services available. What UNI currently has is a Student Information System that functions, but it is one that has been created by UNI staff over the last 20 years a piece at a time. The core of this existing system comes from a vendor that is no longer in this business, which means we no longer have a vendor updating the technology that they sold us nor are they supporting it. We're in this sort of nether land, it's not a crisis today but it's clear that's this system will not be sustainable.

In reviewing the informational sheet for the Senate, Dr. Hogan noted some of the background and rationale, with some technical information given. The goals for this project is for UNI to be able to transition to a new system that will improve efficiency, and more critically, increase the effectiveness of critical processes that rely on this data. This is the information service that includes everything from course registration, developing a class list, grade reports and transcripts, dropping and adding classes, maintaining information about student's academic advisors, and beyond. The World Wide Web and the Internet give us significant new potential, and many of our sister institutions have already transitioned to new systems that allow students, faculty and staff to do much more of their own updating and checking 24/7 through a web-interface that is more user friendly and will ultimately allow us to use this technology to support our academic program for the next generation of users. Project goals, guiding principles on how they want to approach this project and project phases are listed. Some activities are currently underway to begin to involve the campus community in helping to define what it is we need out of this new potentiality.

Dr. Hogan stated that there are vendor previews scheduled on campus for Tuesday, March 25, and urged faculty to attend these previews. The purpose of these reviews is simply to demonstrate

the potential that exists within a state of the arts system. These are not demonstrations of systems that we need to decide between to purchase, these are examples of what systems generically are able to do these days; they're meant to spur our thinking as we proceed with our planning. There will be a point in time when there will be a web survey where functions that we think we need here at UNI will be listed and every system user will be surveyed, which will be that last two weeks of this semester.

Dr. Hogan noted that one of the specific challenges that they will be facing is the question of "customization". There are some major vendors who have developed these systems over time and they have been continually refining them as demand indicates. They are now at a point in time where they have a set of things that they can offer. This is the point where there may be disagreement about how we proceed and it is critical that people are thoughtful in how they provide input to this process, what that input is, and how we might engage. This project could cost UNI anywhere between $2 million and $20 million. The software itself is a set price. The question is if we as a community are willing to take a hard look at our current processes and make refinements so we can maximize what the software will do as opposed to trying to re-formalize an old process without looking at it critically. Using the example of moving into a new house, you clean out and have your garage sale prior to the move. Dr. Hogan stated that that is the same idea here. One of the keys things we'll need to do as a campus community is to look at our processes; what does it take for a student to add a class, who's required to approve it, where does the student go, where does the process happen, who has to sign off on it, how many people have to sign off. That would be a process review and by streamlining it we will reduce the amount of money we have to spend in the new system as opposed at saying our current system has twelve steps so we'll need a new twelve-step process. He urged senators to contact any of the people listed if there are questions and that Jan Hanish is the project manager.

Senator O'Kane asked if the two vendor previews will vary in content.

Dr. Hogan responded that they are two different vendors but they are both student information systems.

Senator Neuhaus asked in by switching to a system that is Internet based are we entering into to something with greater

"hackability" then what we currently have? Or was the old system so "clunky" that it was easier to comprise?

Dr. Hogan replied that he's not an expert in this area but his understanding is that the new systems might be more accessible, they do have greater security capacity built in from the ground up, they've been created in an era when security is an issue. Our current systems was created in a time when security wasn't an issue and everything that's been done to that systems has been a "patch" after the fact.

Dr. Hanish added that one of the issues is that because of our old system we have a lot of distributed information so there may be information sitting on desktops in offices that's been pulled off and stored. UNI's been told that that is where our vulnerability is, not necessarily in our central system. With a new system the information would be within one shell and you would protect that shell.

Senator Smith asked about the process redesign, would that be done by internal people or by outside consultants.

Dr. Hogan responded that that's a great question and the team is discussing that right now. There are consulting firms available that specialized in that but we also have some staff on campus that have received some training individually. He has been meeting with them to get a sense from them of what their view of it would be, and it has not yet been decided. Additionally they are looking at how long a window of time they need to allow for that. Do we review all the processes or just the few that are the most complex, that's what is being looked at.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas asked about membership on the evaluation team, noting that while Dean Callahan is on the Executive Steering Committee, there are no other College of Education representatives, nor a student representative on the Evaluation Team.

Dr. Hogan responded that they are aware of this, and will be meeting with the Information Technology Student Advisory Group and hope to recruit several students with professional interest in IT who might be willing to serve. Dean Callahan has also been very clear about including Teacher Education representation and one of the workshops is geared towards them.

Senator East asked if there has been discussion with other Regent's institutions about sharing resources, as we all have

Student Information Systems and one systems is probably cheaper than three and more easily manageable.

Dr. Hogan replied that he does agree on one level, however, there are differences in the way courses are framed, the degree process structure, degree requirements, things of that nature. The systems tend to reflect the operations of the institution. There is probably some core portion that could be in common. Iowa and Iowa State are both in the same situation that UNI is but as of yet none of the three have acquired a new system and could simply share it with the others. The biggest challenge would be getting the three institutions lined up to make the change at the same time.

Chair Licari thanked Dr. Hogan and Dr. Hanish.

COMMENTS FROM FACULTY CHAIR, IRA SIMET

Faculty Chair Simet had no comments today.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR ITEMS FOR DOCKETING

955 CSBS Faculty Senate Resolution – Liberal Arts Core
     Committee

Motion to docket in regular order as item #863 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

956 Liberal Arts Core Committee 2006-2007 Annual Report

Motion to docket in regular order as item #864 by Senator Smith; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

957 Capstone Management Guidelines

Chair Licari noted that this came with a recommendation from Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, to be docketed out of regular order to be discussed at today's meeting.

Motion to docket out of regular order at the head of the docket as item #865 by Senator Basom; second by Senator O'Kane.

Senator East stated that it is his understanding that this needs to be discussed and approve so curriculum matters can be forwarded but there are lots of things in there that do not related directly to the Curriculum Package going forward. He opposes docketing out of regular order because faculty have had no access to this information for review prior to today's Senate discussion.

Motion passed with 4 opposed.

Siobahn Morgan, Liberal Arts Core Committee Coordinator, noted that the document outlines the rules that the LACC have been operating under previously and the added things that need to be considered are due to the fact that Capstone is now something that is university wide, not just in one college. Things such as clarifying how to manage and maintain it, how to assess it and providing some detailed and specific rules in some cases are needed. Catalog changes are also to be considered. If there are concerns she would like to know.

Senator Basom stated that these guidelines were sent to colleges and departments for their input.

Dr. Morgan reiterated that yes, this information was sent out, but whether it was distributed or not she's unaware.

Senator East remarked that all the information that faculty have is that Capstone management is going to be considered; there was nothing about where it is, how it's accessible.

Chair Licari commented that this did go out to the campus as much it could have been distributed. If Senators did not get this information there was a breakdown somewhere.

Associate Provost Kopper brought forth information from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), noting that they did not discuss the entire Capstone Management document but they did discuss the numbering issue because of the significance to the UNI catalogue. She shared with the Senate what the UCC discussed and their recommendation. In talking about the numbering of the Capstone courses, the UCC felt that because Capstone courses should encouraged as university-wide enrollment, as per the model, they were concerned that with the departmental three-digit prefix, if it's assigned to a Capstone course it may primarily attract those departmental majors or minors instead of the university-wide draw. They also stated that since the Capstone courses are inter-disciplinary and are

designed primarily to serve the Liberal Arts Core that cross listing of the Capstone courses was a concern. They also noted that other departments can teach these Capstone courses and they felt there needed to be a unique way to identify the Capstone courses. The committee also voiced some concern that the use of 010: prefix might possibly give the perception that these Capstone courses may be lower level courses when they are in fact upper level courses. It was the consensus of members that one unique prefix to identify all Capstone courses was preferred to highlight the nature of the courses as per the model and to make it easier for students. The possibility of the three digit prefix "CAP" for all Capstone courses was suggested and discussed. It was moved and seconded to replace the three digit prefix for all Capstone courses with the prefix "CAP" to better identify the Capstone courses and reflect the intent of the Capstone model, and to avoid using the 010: to avoid the misperception that Capstone courses are lower level. This motion was carried unanimously.

Senator O'Kane asked if it was suggested to be 100 level course, CAP:1XX?

Associate Provost Kopper responded that that was correct.

Dr. Morgan added that it has always been suggested that Capstone is :100 level; the departmental prefix was 010:.

Associate Provost Kopper continued, the UCC felt that some people may misinterpret the 010: prefix as being lower level and that was why the suggestion was raised to identify them with CAP:1XX. It also came up in the discussion that it would also more easily identify those courses for students and would be a university-wide indicator of Capstone.

Senator East asked if there was any significance attached to the course number, other than it's a :100 level? So then there are only 99 possibly Capstone courses?

Dr. Morgan responded that there are actually less because we can't use :159 and things like that.

Senator East reiterated that it's a limited set of courses.

Dr. Morgan replied that there's always the option of extending or changing whatever the three-digit prefix is.

Senator East asked if there is any intent to try to make the number similar, or maybe cross list them?

Dr. Morgan responded that Diane Wallace, Coordinator Student Statistics and University Catalog, Registrar's Office, is doing the numbering and is unsure of what her system is. Currently the order that they come in, they get that as their section number. The first Capstone courses that were approved and offered were given 010:159, with the section number designating the order, Sec. 01 the first one approved, Sec. 02 the second one approved, and so forth. Ms. Wallace may be ordering them in a similar way but there is no specific format.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas suggested that since a common prefix will be used it would be good to identify in the description where the course comes from, which college it originates from.

Dr. Morgan commented that they don't do that for the Humanities, which is taught by two colleges. She added that in some ways you can kind of guess where it's coming from such as from the faculty person assigned to teach that particular semester.

Senator Soneson ask as all Capstone will have at least the 010:, does that mean that any faculty member who wants can teach that course if they want? Is that the case?

Dr. Morgan replied that she has no control over who teaches what but she would expect faculty assignments based by their department heads would be logical.

Senator Soneson reiterated that it is controlled by department heads. However, he continued, if a 010: course is really open to anyone who wants to teach it they would then have to get approval from their department head.

Dr. Morgan responded that that is what Section IV of the Capstone Management Guidelines deals with. She has no idea of what Capstone is being offered in any given future semester until she sees the printed catalogue.

Senator Soneson continued that this means that these courses are really taken out of the department of origination.

Dr. Morgan replied that that is usually the case, but not always.

Senator Soneson continued, the fact that it has a 010: takes it out of that department.

Dr. Morgan responded that yes, in that respect.

Senator Soneson continued, stating that that department no longer has control over the content and the teaching of that course.

Dr. Morgan responded that in a way, yes. However, they have tried to incorporate some language in Section IV where they suggest that people who have never taught a Capstone course and are interested in doing so talk with the LACC as well as the original course proposer. There could be a case where someone just goes off and does it on their own with their department head's approval and the LACC doesn't find out until after the fact. They would then have to do checking after the fact, how well the course was taught and those sorts of questions.

Senator Soneson commented that in the past the College of Natural Sciences (CNS) has controlled a lot of money to give to people who teach Capstone. Now that it is an open course with people from different colleges being able to teach Capstone, does this mean that the money that was used for the summer Capstone will be spread among the colleges equally?

Interim Provost Lubker replied that the money doesn't follow the student credit any more.

Senator Soneson continued, doesn't each college get a certain lump of money that they use for summer school?

Interim Provost Lubker responded that yes they do, for summer school.

Senator Soneson remarked that CNS's lump was created with the idea that they were going to have all the instructors of Capstone. This has changed and he's wondering if there will be a re-allocation.

Interim Provost Lubker replied that even though the course has a different designation with the CAP:, it will still be taught by people in CNS.

Dr. Morgan noted that this summer UNI is offering the fewest number of Capstone sections. Last summer students just didn't

take it with about 60% enrollment this those sections, while the "non old" Capstone sections were full.

In response to Senator Soneson's question, Dr. Morgan noted that the old Capstones are two credit hours and most of the new Capstone's are three credit hours. So the LACC cut down the number of Capstone offerings for this summer in CNS, which are the "old" model, because the students don't like them. And fewer and fewer of the "old" Capstone sections are being offered every semester because more and more students, 40%, are enrolling in the New Capstones, and they expect that to increase which will decrease the "old" Capstone sections.

Senator Smith asked about Section VI, Student Outcomes Assessment (SOA), noting that the involvement in Capstone sections for Outcomes Assessments will be done on a voluntary basis by instructors. In the past when people responsible for SOAs had to do this, it can be difficult to get instructors to participate and at many universities for a course such as this that is an end of program course it would be considered normal for faculty to be required to set aside a session for SOAs. During the development of this document was there any discussion of that, and if so why a more forceful requirement wasn't included?

Dr. Morgan responded that there was discussion and would like it to be mandatory if it could be done where possible. However, that would force the faculty member to change their course to incorporate this. To get the students to take the MAPP (Measure of Proficiency and Progress) test seriously you need to make the test count for something, what will it count for in that person's course? They then have to change their course to account for that score. Not every Capstone course would be a good course to have this done because the MAPP test is only for seniors. Some of the courses do have juniors, sophomores and freshmen in them; it would be worthless to do the MAPP test.

Senator Smith stated that his feeling is that instructors who have the privilege of teaching a Capstone course as part of that should be mandated to make a session of their course available for SOAs. It may or may not be used but they should be encouraged, not required, to provide extra credit participation to students for taking the MAPP. In Business Administration they do something very similar, it's an end of program course and take an end of program exam in that course, and most instructors, at their discretion, give students credit both for participating and for their scores. Something like that seems

to be consistent with the needs of SOAs at this university, which we have to start being responsive to.

Dr. Morgan added that the difference is that the course Senator Smith is talking about is in the program for those majors; with Capstone you have all different majors. The importance is great but to mandate it would face a lot of opposition.

Senator Smith asked why a mandate for faculty in a college differs from a mandate for faculty in a university?

Dr. Morgan replied that in a college those are with majors.

Senator Smith continued that it seems to him that we ought to be participating in SOAs as a normal part of faculty responsibilities.

Dr. Morgan noted that she would like to see it current but it probably would not be approved if mandatory assessment was included.

Senator Soneson stated that there might be a problem with proving it, as there are some who are philosophically opposed to the MAPP test and would not want to embrace it!

Senator East asked if most of the instructors teaching Capstone requested that it be a Capstone? It aims to meet certain goals and he agrees with Senator Smith that it seems perfectly reasonable to require SOAs if you want to count this as a Capstone. It can be taught without Capstone credit but if you want it to count as a Capstone course it has to be evaluated with the standard outcomes assessment tool, whatever that might be, because instructors would know going in that it was proposed as a Capstone course. In addition, he thinks it should be made very stronger in SOAs not only to collect data but to also use that data. There should be some period after collecting baseline data that you ought to be able to use that data in a reasonable fashion, and you should have a plan for that sooner rather than later.

Dr. Morgan stated that the people that wrote the proposals that are currently in Capstone did not have any information about assessments, that wasn't part of the requirements. Requiring assessments at this point is changing the rules after they came up with these courses. She would like to have assessments done but she doesn't have the authority to say so.

Senator Smith noted that he's agnostic about what to use, he just feels strongly that program assessment, assessment of the Liberal Arts Core, needs to be done somewhere and this is the obvious place to do it.

In response to Senator Smith's request to propose a friendly amendment, Chair Licari stated that we could propose a friendly amendment or send it back to the LACC.

Senator Smith remarked that as there are some other concerns about course numbering he hopes to include the issue of SOAs, as something the Senate would like the LACC to reconsider.

Senator Bruess asked Senator Smith about his request for SOAs, is he meaning to assess the entire LAC? How many SOAs are going to make up this whole?

Senator Smith responded that there are some program level kinds of things that are often done in assessments, and they are done at the end of the program. Humanities is one of the few common courses that all students have to take at UNI and assessments could be done at the end of that course, or also at the end of the program and ask what would we like all of our students to know and do they know it when they leave here? This is the obvious place to do it, and it is a program level assessment of the LAC and in some ways of their whole university experience and we have to make provisions for it. His suggestion is that instructors be required to set a class session aside for assessment, but doesn't mean it would always be used. But this way people couldn't opt out and use only the "good guys."

Dr. Morgan noted that this semester she went through all the enrollments in all the Capstones courses to check high percentage courses for seniors. Those instructors were contacted and asked if they would agree to an assessment and received minimal response, which is frustrating. She also noted however that not everyone would be eligible because not everyone would have a good student population for it.

Senator Bruess continued, if it is a university issue couldn't it be done at the university level? He suggested that in May or December, when the seniors are gradating, can't they be approached and respond to these different questions through our new information system that we'll be getting. And students would be required to do so or they could not graduate. That would be a much better way because many classes have juniors and lower level students in them.

Senator Smith commented that until we get to that point we need something stronger that will work within the existing system, and mandating faculty involvement with this course would be a good step.

Senator Basom asked if the Senate could return to the numbering issue as she thought that was the most pressing issue.

Associate Provost Kopper replied that she would have Senator Patton, UNI Registrar, respond to that because that's a catalogue issue. The UCC pulled that out because they wanted to try to be responsive to the catalogue concern.

Senator Patton stated that the Registrar's Office is primarily looking for guidance as to what the faculty would like done. They have to look at a lot of different programs that run within the Student Information System to see what it would take to accomplish this. Estimated programming time is 2-4 weeks so it can be done but if the Senate thinks it coveys to students something that's very important rather than a number; does the "CAP" really tell the students what the course is rather than a number does or a course listing and number as we currently do now. In talking about the new Student Information System, in three years from now he'll come back to all the departments and say they're reopening the Student Information System because we want to renumber the course. He anticipates that most departments will want to go to an alpha-designator with :100, :200 levels and so on. That is currently on the horizon anyway, so they're not philosophically opposed to that but it will take a little bit of time to do it and it has to be based on something that means something to students.

Associate Provost Kopper stated that what she's hearing is to send this back to the LACC; was he raising the issue of whether the numbering has to be decided now? What is the timeline in terms of the catalogue publication for determining what those courses will be numbered?

Patti Rust, Associate Registrar, stated that the effective date for the new catalogue is now May 1. In response to Chair Licari's question if the Senate needs to pull out the numbering question and decide on it today, yes.

Senator East reiterated that this is the part that is going in the catalogue and asked what the current practice is?

Dr. Morgan responded that there is none. In some cases courses that were approved for Capstone that were brand new experimental courses, when they came up through the curriculum process some asked for a 010: designation, some asked for departmental designation. Many asking for departmental designation wanted to use the courses as electives in the department. There was no guidance so they just did whatever they wanted, and an existing course added to Capstone would continue with the existing departmental number.

Senator Patton noted that the Registrar's Office have renumbered departments in the past and those can be done at any time.

Associate Provost Kopper responded that the question is, does the Faculty Senate need to pull out of this document the numbering strictly for catalogue purposes so that it reaches the Registrar's publication deadline this summer. In the new catalogue these Capstone courses will have to be listed and the question is, how do we list them? List them as 010:, do we cross list them, or, as the UCC recommended, list them as CAP? What the Senate needs to know is what is Diane Wallace's drop-dead date that she needs this by?

Ms. Rust reported Diane and staff are proofing the catalogue this week.

Chair Licari stated that the Senate needs to decide today on the numbering of the Capstone courses for the catalogue.

Senator Basom noted that it was her understanding that because this was approved on an ad hoc basis there were courses approved for Capstone that currently don't have a Capstone designation or prefix, they use their departmental prefix. It is important that they all have a Capstone designation and are all listed in one place in the catalogue. Whether the designation is 010: or CAP: is not the issue. If the UCC has discussed this and believes that CAP is a better designation then that should be fine.

Senator Smith remarked that he's not thrilled by the use of CAP for the Capstone designation because that sets it up so that similar things can be done for other courses. He is has a very strong feeling that everything should be listed as 010: and cross listing is okay. There should be one place in the catalogue to find all of the Capstone courses and he prefers the 010: designation.

Senator East commented that current practice does have it much like the rest of the LAC where you have alternative courses, as in the Social Science requirement where there is a list of courses students must take for the A requirement, a list of courses students must take for the B requirement, and so on. Same thing happens with Capstone, there's a big list, some 010: some have a departmental prefix. We don't actually have to do anything for the students to have one place to find the Capstone listings.

Dr. Morgan noted that all the Capstone courses are listed in the front of the course schedules under LAC, but in the catalogue they are scattered about.

Senator East noted that all of the Social Science courses aren't listed in the same place in the course schedule either; they're in different departments, different places.

Revised motion by Senator Basom to accept Section III of the Capstone Management Guidelines; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Basom noted that Section III is written with 010: as the Capstone prefix designation so if there is strong feeling that it should be CAP it should be noted.

Senator Neuhaus commented that there was a committee that thought about this longer than the Senate has, the UCC, and they thought it should be CAP:.

Senator Smith remarked that it was the UCC, and they didn't originally draft the Capstone Management Guidelines; they were commenting on something produced by the LACC.

Senator Basom noted that the LACC did discuss it and preferred 010:.

Faculty Chair Simet noted that every three-digit prefix has a departmental number, what does 010: signify?

Dr. Morgan replied that that is used as Interdisciplinary, which also include the Presidential Scholar's courses and things like that. If you want to make it separate, CAP: indicates that it's Capstone and it has its own place.

Senator Soneson commented that Capstone courses are supposed to be interdisciplinary by their nature.

Associate Provost Kopper noted from the minutes of the UCC meeting where this was discussed, it was suggested not cross listing the Capstone courses with departmental numbers because of the concern that that might attract departmental students and deter from the original Capstone model where one of the guiding principles was to promote the interdisciplinary aspect of the course.

Senator Van Wormer stated she thought it would be important to not have it listed with departments because those departmental students would get ahead on the other students at registration time. It would be better to keep them all together.

Senator Smith responded that the experience has been these sections of Capstone close fast and even in cross listing them you don't lose that much to students in the majors. People who offer these courses within their departments do want students in their departments to be aware of these classes. It is valuable to cross list them but it's even more important to have something at the front that contains everything where all students can go to fairly quickly. This provision as it is written provides for that.

Senator Schafer asked for clarification on the 010: designation. He's hearing an argument that all should be consolidated so students can go to one place and find out what's Capstone. However, if it's given the 010: designation there are other non-Capstone courses already being offered as 010:. If that's the rationale, then CAP should be used.

Dr. Morgan replied that there are other 010: courses that are not Capstone; Capstone courses are 010:159. And if this is changed to CAP: the suffix number will be :1XX.

Senator Basom modified her motion that was previously modified to replace the 010: Capstone prefix with CAP: in Section III of the Capstone Management Guidelines; second by Senator Soneson.

Senator Soneson asked where these courses would be located in the catalogue?

Dr. Morgan responded that we do have an option, but it would probably be better at the beginning of the list, letters before numbers.

Chair Licari noted that he thought it would be best at the beginning.

Senator Marchesani asked if this will be opening the door to a trend we may not want, to have letter designation? Once we do this, when will it stop? Will we have combination of letters and numbers? This needs to be a conscientious university decision if we're going to start moving in this direction. Why can't a department now say we want MKT: or MGM:?

Chair Licari replied that UNI's Registrar Phil Patton did just suggest that that is probably on the horizon anyway.

Senator Patton responded that Senator Marchesani has a good point, when we go to a new Student Information System one of the possibilities is going to alpha designation. He doesn't want to go that direction until that time because everything the Registrar's Office has to do will become more complex, things such as degree audits, transfer evaluations. If we limit it to one thing right now, Capstone, they can work around that but he sure doesn't want to open the door to this on an institutional-wide basis.

Chair Licari stated that the Senate can limit that and the opportunities for departments to do renumbering will be limited between now and the institution of a new Student Information System. This Capstone issue is a special case and it does make sense to see if we're interested in setting aside a portion of the catalogue and the registration booklet to clearly identify for students what is a Capstone class and what's not.

Senator Bruess asked if the Capstone classes would still be cross listed?

Senator Basom noted that that is how it is written in the proposed guidelines.

Revised motion by Senator Basom to accept Section III of the Capstone Management Guidelines was approved.

The Senate voted to approve Senator Basom's second amended motion on Section III of the Capstone Management Guidelines which was to replace the 010: Capstone prefix with CAP: in Section III of the Capstone Management Guideline.

Senator Soneson noted that this means the prefix designation 010: for Capstone will be replaced with CAP:.

Motion to docket in regular order the remainder of the Capstone Management Guidelines by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Basom. Motion passed.

958 Dropped Certificate Program in Long Term Care

Motion to docket in regular order as item #866 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East.

Senator East noted that this also pertains to the catalogue and the Senate could easily take care of this today.

Friendly amendment to docket out of regular order at the head of the docket as item #866 by Senator Bruess; second by Senator East. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the dropping of this certificate program by Senator East; second by Senator Bruess. Motion passed.

959 Update to LAC Guidelines – Subcategory 4B

Motion to docket in regular order by Senator East; second by Senator Funderburk.

Senator Soneson asked if this item is also relevant to the catalogue and should it be addressed today?

Dr. Morgan stated that in a way it is but it is part of the instructional guidelines in registering for courses and if there are no majors in that area no one really cares about it.

Senator Soneson responded that we should put it in there to have it out of the way.

Senator Schumacher-Douglas suggested that the Senate take care of it now while we can.

Amended motion to docket out of regular order at the head of the docket as item #86 by Senator East; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the Update to the LAC Guidelines by Senator O'Kane; second by Senator Schumacher-Douglass. Motion passed.

NEW BUSINESS

Faculty Chair Simet stated that he has information about the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence, which needs to be discussed in Executive Session.

Motion to go into Executive Session by Senator Soneson; second by Senator Neuhaus. Motion passed.

Motion to approve the list of candidates for the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence by Senator Funderburk; second by Senator Van Wormer. Motion passed.

Chair Licari called for a motion to re-establish the nomination materials for the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence.

Motion by Senator Soneson to use the second list for the nomination materials for the Regents Awards for Faculty Excellence; second by Senator Funderburk. Motion passed with two opposed.

Faculty Chair Simet thanked the committee members, Bill Callahan, John Fritch, Jim Jurgenson, Mike Mixsell, and Chris Neuhaus for their work on this.

Senator Soneson also thanked Faculty Chair Simet for his work.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Senator Bruess to adjourn; second by Senator Soneson. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Dena Snowden
Faculty Senate Secretary

Capstone Management Guidelines

Following the approval of the "New Capstone Model" by the UNI Faculty Senate on February 26, 2007, the management of Capstone Experience courses will be under the auspices of the Liberal Arts Core Committee and the office of the Liberal Arts Core Coordinator.

The following document includes methods for approving courses for the Capstone Experience, along with the guidelines for the offering, staffing and assessment for Capstone Experience courses.

I. The Capstone Experience Criteria

Capstone courses are designed to prepare UNI students for the complex world of ideas that they will experience during their lives as educated citizens. These courses are integrative and sufficiently flexible in content to allow and encourage widespread participation by UNI faculty.

With this in mind, the Liberal Arts Core Capstone course requirement was revised to provide each UNI undergraduate with a choice of courses from a list approved by the Liberal Arts Core Committee (LACC) and the UNI Faculty Senate.

The requirements for the Capstone Experience Course are that the course

- will have enrollment limited to juniors and seniors;
- will be attractive and accessible to students from a wide spectrum of disciplinary backgrounds;
- will, at a minimum, either 1) integrate content from two or more diverse disciplines, or 2) emphasize service-based learning and provide engagement with communities outside UNI.

In identifying Capstone courses, the LACC will be guided by the following desirable course attributes. That the course

- be intellectually challenging and promote development of higher-order thinking skills;
- make student disciplinary diversity a strength of its design;
- link theory to practice through applied problem-solving activities;
- promote the development of skills and dispositions associated with self-directed, life-long learning.

II. Capstone Experience Course Approval – Currently Existing Courses

Currently existing and new, experimental courses may be proposed for the Capstone Experience Category of the Liberal Arts Core (LAC) according to the guidelines given below. It is recommended that courses be proposed well in advance of their initial offering as a Capstone Experience course. Due to the timeline that is typically required for scheduling, a proposal should be made at least one year before the semester it is expected to be first offered for Capstone Experience credit.

The following guidelines should be followed:
a. Submission of a "Liberal Arts Core Course Proposal" form (available at the LAC website (http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/lac) or from the LAC Coordinator. The form should also include a proposed syllabus and/or thorough course description indicating how the course would be appropriate for a Capstone Experience course. The current Capstone Experience Criteria (section I above) should be consulted for information on the desirable characteristics of a Capstone Experience course.
b. The course proposer(s) meets with the LACC to discuss the proposal. This will be scheduled by mutual agreement by the course proposer(s) and the LAC Coordinator.
c. The LACC will determine, based upon information provided by the course proposer(s) via steps (a) and (b) whether the course is appropriate for inclusion into the LAC as a Capstone Experience course. If further information is required, this will be conveyed to the proposer(s) by the LAC Coordinator and then presented to the LACC at the earliest convenience.
d. If an existing course is approved as a Capstone Experience course by the LACC, a proposal to include the course in the LAC will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate.
   If a new course is approved as a Capstone Experience course by the LACC, it may be offered a maximum of three times as an experimental course. If the proposer(s) would like the course to be included in

the university curriculum, the regular procedure for adding a course to the UNI curriculum should be followed.

e. Once the course proposal has been docketed and placed on the Faculty Senate agenda, the LAC Coordinator and course proposer(s) should be available at the Senate meeting to provide information concerning the course and address any issues that may arise during discussion in the Faculty Senate meeting.

f. If the Faculty Senate approves the course for inclusion into the LAC as a Capstone Experience Course, the LAC Coordinator will inform the proposer(s), their department(s), their Dean(s) and the Registrar's office of the course's status in the LAC.

III Capstone Experience Course Listings

All courses that have been approved for the Capstone Category will be listed with the following prefix: 010:1XX.

Currently existing courses that are subsequently approved for inclusion into the Capstone Category will be cross listed under the previous designation as well as the 010:1XX listing, e.g., 010:123/820:140.

New courses that have been proposed for the Capstone Category may be listed either with only the 010:1XX designation or cross listed with the originating department/college prefix included (e.g., 010:123/990:155). The course proposer(s) will determine how they would like to have the course listed following consultation with the LACC and LAC Coordinator.

IV Capstone Experience Course Staffing

Departments and colleges should provide copies of their proposed future semester offerings of Capstone Experience courses to the LAC Coordinator's office at the same time, or prior to the submission of the course schedules to the Registrar's office. Staffing for Capstone Experience courses will be dependent upon individuals and departments. In general those who have previously taught or proposed the course will staff it.

If a faculty member is interested in teaching an existing
Capstone Experience course for the first time, the faculty
member should contact the LAC Coordinator for information
concerning the course objectives. The faculty member must
provide a copy of the proposed syllabus for the course to the
LACC for review as soon as possible. The LACC will determine if
the objectives of the course as it was originally approved by
the LACC are being met by the syllabus. Further discussions
with the instructor may be needed if questions arise.

V. Capstone Experience Course Assessments and Monitoring

Once a year a copy of the most current course syllabus should be
sent to the LAC Coordinator's office by each instructor of a
Capstone Experience course. The LAC Coordinator will send out
reminders to all Capstone Experience instructors concerning
syllabi before the start of the fall semester.

Each semester the following information will be obtained from
the Registrar's office and the administrative computer system
for all Capstone Experience Courses –
    a. Enrollment levels/class sizes
    b. Major distribution
    c. Grade distribution
    d. Instructor classification (tenured/tenure-track or
       non-tenured/tenure-track)

Once a year each course will have the Capstone Experience
assessment tool (appendix A) administered. In the event that
there are multiple instructors for a course, the assessment tool
will be administered to at least one section taught by each
instructor of the course. Instructors who are interested may
obtain the results of the assessment, with individual student
responses made anonymous.

VI. Student Outcomes Assessments

Capstone sections may be used to provide information on Student
Learning Outcomes by means of the MAPP or other standardized
tests. This will be done on a voluntary basis by instructors
who will provide incentives for students to participate in
standardized testing.

VII. Capstone Experience Category Review

The Capstone Experience courses will be reviewed at least every six years by a subcommittee consisting of members of the LACC and Capstone Experience instructors. The review procedure will follow the current guidelines of the LAC Category Reviews. Information to include in the review will consist of

- o Enrollment, offering frequency, student diversity and grading data
- o Instructor information – rank, department, college, etc.
- o Course questionnaire for each course in the category
- o Summary of results from the annual Capstone Experience assessments
- o Representative course syllabi

The review will address several areas, most importantly as to whether the courses are meeting the goals of the Capstone Experience. If a course is thought to be deficient in meeting these goals, the LACC will consult with the instructor(s) and determine if the course should be recommended for removal from the category.   The recommendation must be approved by the Faculty Senate before the course is removed from the Capstone Experience Category, effective at the start of the next academic year.

The category review will be submitted to the Faculty Senate for acceptance. Once accepted, copies of the review will be distributed to all departments/units on campus and posted on the LAC website.