

Academic Affairs Committee, 17 September 2007

In attendance: Jorge Nobo, Bill Roach, Tom Prasch, VPAA Robin Bowen, Frank Chorba, Karen Camarda, David Pownell, Patricia Renn-Scanlan

Jorge Nobo was selected to continue as chair of the committee.

Tom Prasch was designated secretary.

The committee moved to accept the deletion of EN 341.

The committee took as a group the series of changes in Art and Art History programs (for the BA in Art History, adding the requirement AR 131, Basic Digital Art, reducing independent research hours to 3, and moving required courses RG 105, RG 106 or EN 210 to a correlate course; for the BFA in Art History, substituting AR 131 for AR 220, Darkroom Photography; for the BFA with Licensure, requiring AR 131 and deleting AR 220; for the BA in Art, adding AR 131, deleting the requirement of AR 141, Drawing II, or AR 220, those courses becoming elective studio options, and deleting the 3 hour workshop requirement among elective studio courses; for the BFA degree in art, adding AR 131 and changing elective studio courses from 21 to 18 hours). The committee moved to approve the changes.

Nobo cited the two outstanding charges to the committee:

First, to continue the review of general-education programs that began (with consideration of mathematics, English, and PE requirements) last year. Nobo suggested continuing a piecemeal approach to the issue, using the recent survey of faculty perceptions to highlight areas in more immediate need of address, and finding a way to connect changes to proposals by VPAA-till-last-year Ron Wasserstein for signature general-education programs that might connect to the Washburn Transformational Experience.

Second, to take up the proposed policy statement about course numbers, prerequisites, and intended audiences for courses.

VPAA Robin Bowen noted that her office supported the development of a signature program that exemplified Washburn University, and suggested that such a program needed to be founded on basic skills about which there was broad agreement. She suggested that the committee might ask what we expected of the “grad at grad”: what we wanted a Washburn student to look like in terms of being a good citizen in a global world, with the knowledge and tools to critically analyze situations from multiple perspectives.

A wide-ranging discussion of the issue of general education followed, with attention given to the problem of coming to agreement on needed skills, the new problems contemporary requirements to understand technology and science have brought to bear,

the question of what components of the campus would be involved in providing general education, the question of how to link general education with the Transformational Experience, the need for a curriculum that focused on ways of knowing and that incorporated multiculturalism and diversity issues, the problem of programs with limited room for electives, the issues raised by possible team-teaching options for general education, ways to develop interdisciplinary courses, the possibility of coordinating courses for incoming cohorts of students, issues that have arisen with the continuing implementation of WTEs, and the question of what comparable institutions are doing with their general-education programs. No conclusions were reached.

At the close of the meeting, Roach suggested that the committee needed to be included in the campus discussion of the use of human subjects. Nobo promised to raise that issue before the Faculty Senate.

The meeting was adjourned.