

University of Nebraska at Kearney

**OpenSPACES@UNK: Scholarship, Preservation, and Creative Endeavors**

---

Academic Affairs Committee Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

4-18-2019

## April 2019 Academic Affairs Minutes

University of Nebraska at Kearney Academic Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openspaces.unk.edu/acaffairs>

---

**Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee****Minutes from Meeting****Thursday, April 18, 2019****WRNH 2147**

**Present:** Debbie Bridges (CBT), Derek Broeckner (FS), Lindsay Brownfield (LIB), Joel Cardenas (AA), Mark Ellis (AA), Brooke Envick (CBT), Ralph Hanson (CAS), Bailey Koch (COE), Kim Schipporeit (REG)

**Absent:** Jasmine Beringer (SS), Jack Clark (SS), Kate Heelan (COE), Julie Shaffer (CAS)

**Guests:** Steve Hall (Accounting, Finance, and Economics), Sherri Harms (Cyber Systems), Ross Taylor (Cyber Systems)

Chair Bridges called the meeting to order at 3:34.

Bridges reminded the committee of the combined March and April agenda due to campus closure on March 14<sup>th</sup>.

Hanson/Koch moved to approve all items on the agenda that were in the interest of our guests. This included items #132 - #150, except for item #146. Motion passed. The discussion moved to item #134. Schipporeit asked Hall to justify why the Accounting Emphasis needs to go over the standard 62 hours and include 65 hours. Hall explained that students must have 150 hours to sit for the CPA exam, which is a state law. Students must also meet the common core Business Division requirements. The combination of these two factors forces the Accounting Emphasis to 65 hours. Bridges called the question. Motion passed.

Hanson/Brownfield moved to approve item #146. Bridges called the question. Motion passed. Bridges called the question. Motion passed.

Koch/Brownfield moved to approve items #151 - #157. Motion passed. Discussion ensued. Bridges called the question. Motion passed.

Bridges thanked everyone for all of their hard work during the year and wished them all a great summer break.

Koch/Brownfield moved that the meeting adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 3:52.

Respectfully submitted,  
Brooke Envick  
Scribe

Approved via email (April 22, 2019)

**IMPORTANT NOTE:**

The March FSAA meeting was not held due to campus being closed on Thursday, March 14. In consultation with the Registrar's Office, the Committee decided to *combine* the March meeting with the April meeting. This means all the March agenda items (#132 - #150) and the April agenda items (#151 - #157) will be taken up at the April meeting (sub-committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 10, at 3:30 p.m. in WRNH 2147; the full committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 18, at 3:30 p.m. in WRNH 2147).

---

**2018-2019 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

Academic Affairs Subcommittee 3/6/2019  
Academic Affairs Full Committee 3/14/2019

NUMBER, REQUEST, LEVEL, SPECIFIC REQUEST, DEGREE/COURSE, PROGRAM/COURSE,  
TITLE, DEPT, COL, REASON

---

As we approach the end of academic year, we would like to take a moment to inform everyone that in order to make the deadline for the 2019-2020 catalog, all program or course proposals must be at the Academic Affairs level in CIM by Tuesday, April 2 by 5:00 pm.

Please note: This includes courses and program revisions only. New majors will not make it into the 2019-2020 catalog at this point due to the external approvals required.

---

#132, Alter, Course, Prerequisites, ACCT 391, Accounting Information Systems, ACCT/FIN, CBT, CYBR302 has been removed from the business core and we want to remove it as a prerequisite; Change in prerequisites; Old Value: ACCT 251 and MIS 302; New Value: ACCT 251.

#133, Alter, Minor, Data Analytics Minor, CYSY, CBT, Move to Cyber Systems department. Broaden the scope of this program from business analytics to all data analytics. Allow analytical related elective options from programs across campus.

#134, Alter, Program, Business Administration Comprehensive, B.S., Accounting Emphasis, ACCT/FIN, CBT, The follows items are reasons why this Program is being altered: (1) Assurance of Learning data indicate that our students are performing below standards on the "quantitative business analysis" area of the Major Field Exam, (2) the change is consistent with AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility, (3) AACSB business standards are undergoing review, and based on recent changes to the AACSB Accounting Standards and information presented at AACSB conferences, business analytics in the business curriculum is expected to become a specific standard in the near future, and (4) on January 16, 2019, CBT-BD faculty voted to (a) Drop MIS 302 from the business core and replace MIS 302 with a business analytics course and (b) add ACCT 391 and CYBR 302 to the "ECON 301:498 Except ECON 388" requirement.

#135, Alter, Program, Business Administration Comprehensive, B.S., Economics Emphasis, ECON, CBT, The follows items are reasons why this Program is being altered: (1) Assurance of Learning data indicate that our students are performing below standards on the "quantitative business analysis" area of the Major Field Exam, (2) the change is consistent with AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility, (3) AACSB business standards are undergoing review, and based on recent changes to the AACSB Accounting Standards and information presented at AACSB conferences, business analytics in the business curriculum is expected to become a specific standard in the near future, and (4) on January 16, 2019, CBT-BD faculty voted to (a) Drop MIS 302 from the business core and replace MIS 302 with a business

analytics course and (b) add ACCT 391 and CYBR 302 to the “ECON 301:498 Except ECON 388” requirement.

#136, Alter, Program, Business Administration Comprehensive, B.S., Finance Emphasis, ACCT/FIN, CBT, The follows items are reasons why this Program is being altered: (1) Assurance of Learning data indicate that our students are performing below standards on the “quantitative business analysis” area of the Major Field Exam, (2) the change is consistent with AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility, (3) AACSB business standards are undergoing review, and based on recent changes to the AACSB Accounting Standards and information presented at AACSB conferences, business analytics in the business curriculum is expected to become a specific standard in the near future, and (4) on January 16, 2019, CBT-BD faculty voted to (a) Drop MIS 302 from the business core and replace MIS 302 with a business analytics course and (b) add ACCT 391 and CYBR 302 to the “ECON 301:498 Except ECON 388” requirement.

#137, Alter, Program, Business Administration Comprehensive, B.S., Business Intelligence Emphasis, CYSY, CBT, We are moving this program to the Cyber Systems Department, and adjusting the requirements to account for the merger with the CSIT Department and INT program. We changed the name from Management Information Systems to Business Intelligence to reflect industry standards, reflect feedback from the Cyber Systems Advisory Council, discussed at the February 2019 meeting, and reflect current graduate hiring practices. We adjusted courses requirements for current industry needs of graduates. We also add more elective options from programs across campus. We updated the GS Analytic & Quantitative Thought to include a beginning programming course as well as the CYBR 306 Intro to Predictive Modeling course, to ensure that students in this program meet the business analytics requirements voted by the CBT:BD faculty on January 2019. We updated the BS Science requirements to include a statistics course (moved from the Analytics and Quantitative Thought category) as well as social science research methods courses (in Economics), in line with the UNK guidelines, <https://catalog.unk.edu/undergraduate/academics/degrees/bs/>. Doing so, keeps this program in compliance with the CBT:BD core requirements. Because of the uncertainty surrounding the business core, and the need for this program to move from the Marketing/MIS Department to the Cyber Systems Department, at this time, we left the core untouched except that the course MIS 302 has been renumbered CYBR 302.

#138, Alter, Program, Business Administration Comprehensive, B.S., Marketing Emphasis, MKMIS, CBT, The following items are reasons why this Program is being altered: (1) Assurance of Learning data indicate that our students are performing below standards on the “quantitative business analysis” area of the Major Field Exam, (2) the change is consistent with AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility, (3) AACSB business standards are undergoing review, and based on recent changes to the AACSB Accounting Standards and information presented at AACSB conferences, business analytics in the business curriculum is expected to become a specific standard in the near future, and (4) on January 16, 2019, CBT-BD faculty voted to (a) Drop MIS 302 from the business core and replace MIS 302 with a business analytics course and (b) add ACCT 391 and CYBR 302 to the “ECON 301:498 Except ECON 388” requirement.

#139, Alter, Program, Business Administration Comprehensive, B.S., Management Emphasis, MGT, CBT, The follows items are reasons why this Program is being altered: (1) Assurance of Learning data indicate that our students are performing below standards on the “quantitative business analysis” area of the Major Field Exam, (2) the change is consistent with AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility, (3) AACSB business standards are undergoing review, and based on recent changes to the AACSB Accounting Standards and information presented at AACSB conferences, business analytics in the business curriculum is expected to become a specific standard in the near future, and (4) on January 16, 2019, CBT-BD faculty voted to (a) Drop MIS 302 from the business core and replace MIS 302 with a business analytics course and (b) add ACCT 391 and CYBR 302 to the “ECON 301:498 Except ECON 388” requirement.

#140, Alter, Program, Business Administration Comprehensive, B.S., Supply Chain Management Emphasis, MKMIS, CBT, 1. Deleting SCM Emphasis electives (MIS421, MKT336, MKT433, MKT434, MGT415, MGT425, GEOG315, ITEC453) that are either not being offered regularly or that have been determined to no longer be appropriate. Adding electives that are more appropriate (MKT430, MKT437, MKT450). 2. The following items are reasons why this Program is being altered: (1) Assurance of Learning data indicate that our students are performing below standards on the “quantitative business analysis” area of the Major Field Exam, (2) the change is consistent with AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility, (3) AACSB business standards are undergoing review, and based on recent changes to the AACSB Accounting Standards and information presented at AACSB conferences, business analytics in the business curriculum is expected to become a specific standard in the near future, and (4) on January 16, 2019, CBT-BD faculty voted to (a) Drop MIS 302 from the business core and replace MIS 302 with a business analytics course and (b) add ACCT 391 and CYBR 302 to the “ECON 301:498 Except ECON 388” requirement.

#141, Alter, Program, Business Administration, B.S., MGT, CBT, The follows items are reasons why this Program is being altered: (1) Assurance of Learning data indicate that our students are performing below standards on the “quantitative business analysis” area of the Major Field Exam, (2) the change is consistent with AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility, (3) AACSB business standards are undergoing review, and based on recent changes to the AACSB Accounting Standards and information presented at AACSB conferences, business analytics in the business curriculum is expected to become a specific standard in the near future, and (4) on January 16, 2019, CBT-BD faculty voted to (a) Drop MIS 302 from the business core and replace MIS 302 with a business analytics course and (b) add ACCT 391 and CYBR 302 to the “ECON 301:498 Except ECON 388” requirement.

#142, Alter, Minor, Business Administration, MGT, CBT, catalog correction- removed MGT 233.

#143, Alter, Certificate, Software Quality Assurance, CYSY, CBT, Move to Cyber Systems department and make use of existing courses within the new department.

#144, Alter, Course, Prerequisites, Course Description, CYBR 306, Introduction to Predictive Modeling, CYSY, CBT, After teaching the course last fall, we recognize that statistics should be a prerequisite course. Course description and learning objective changes are being made to more accurately reflect the course content and address the business analytics needs of the CBT:BD BABS programs core. We added Assurance of Learning Goals, to show which AACSB curricular standards/guidelines are addressed in this course. We also realized that hands-on labs would add value, and changed the course to be 3 credit hours, which meets as 2 hours lecture; 2 hours lab each week. (We use this 2:1 format in other courses such as CYBR 345). Since this course may be taken by majors outside of the CBT:BD programs, we allow any entry-level statistics course from across campus as the prerequisite; Change in prerequisites; Old Value: Passing score on Business Computer Proficiency Exam or CYBR 182; New Value: MGT 233 or STAT 241 or STAT 345 or BIOL 305 or PSY 250; Change in course description; Old Value: Data Analytics uses real-time processing of sentiment, buzz, social networks, context and/or other data of interest to improve performance and impact. This course introduces predictive modeling to enable more informed decisions and to influence others. Students learn how to develop, explore, model, and answer questions using analytical processes to examine big datasets; New Value: Data Analytics uses real-time processing of sentiment, buzz, social networks, context and/or other data of interest to improve performance and impact. This course will expand on basic statistical and analytical tools for developing an understanding of advanced methods for data analysis and modeling to support decision making. Students learn how to develop, explore, model, and answer questions using analytical processes to examine datasets, including “big data”. Predictive modeling is introduced to show how to use these concepts, and others, to support more informed decisions and to drive business strategy using current and rapidly changing technologies. The course covers the fundamentals of databases, data analysis, data visualization, inferential statistics, and reporting; all supporting predictive and prescriptive analytics. Two hours lecture, two hours lab per week.

#145, Alter, Course, Title, Prerequisites, Course Description, ECON 365, Business Analytics & Decision Making, ECON, CBT, The College of Business and Technology recently supported a change to the Business Division Core Curriculum through a two-thirds majority vote of faculty. The change involves adding Business Analytics as a core course within the core. This change was justified based upon AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility; low student scores in quantitative business analysis on the Major Field Test; and, industry trends representing increased importance of business intelligence and analytics. In light of these changes, the content of this course, ECON 365, is being updated to better reflect the capabilities students need for familiarization with business intelligence and analytics. Specifically, the revisions to the course better reflect teaching the students to meet the following objectives: Data collection/extraction: introduction to and use of tools to collect, extract, and organize data; Data analysis: apply descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive analytics to business problems; Data interpretation: identify patterns in data through interpretation of statistical analyses and visualization. Revisions have been made to better provide students tools for business applications working with data, databases and reports from analytic models through coverage of fundamentals of data analysis, data visualization, and inferential statistics, all supporting descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive analytics; Change in course title; Old Value: Quantitative Methods; New Value: Business Analytics & Decision Making; Change in prerequisites; Old Value: ECON 270 or ECON 271; New Value: ECON 270 or ECON 271 and MGT 233 or equivalent; Change in course description; Old Value: A course to prepare the student with basic mathematical methods in the field of economics; New Value: This course expands on basic statistical and analytics tools so that students learn to think in terms of patterns and models, understand the value of economic and business data to gain key business insight and analyze market conditions, and learn how modeling supports decision making and can be used to evaluate the impact of choices. It covers fundamentals of descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive analytics, with a focus on data visualization. Students will use and interpret economic and business data, databases, and output from analytics models.

#146, Alter, Course, Total Completions, Credits Allowed, Credit Hours, Grading Type, HSCI 475, Internship in Health Sciences, HSCI, CNSS, This course is being changed to add an additional section for 5 credit hours to accommodate the internship needs of Radiography and Respiratory Therapy students. All sections of the course will also become Credit/No Credit grading, which is more appropriate for these types of internships; Change in total completions; Old Value: 1; New Value: 5; Change in total credits allowed; Old Value: 4; New Value: 25; Change in credit hours; Old Value: 1-4; New Value: 1-5; Change in grading type; Old Value: Traditional Grades; New Value: Credit/No Credit.

#147, Alter, Course, Title, Prerequisites, Course Description, MGT 334, Applied Business Analytics, MGT, CBT, The College of Business and Technology recently supported a change to the Business Division Core Curriculum through a two-thirds majority vote of faculty. The change involves adding Business Analytics as a core course within the core. This change was justified based upon AACSB accreditation Standard 9 Curriculum Content for: General Skill Areas, General Business Knowledge Areas, and Technology Agility; low student scores in quantitative business analysis on the Major Field Test; and, industry trends representing increased importance of business intelligence and analytics. In light of these changes, the content of this course, MGT 334, is being updated to better reflect the capabilities students need for familiarization with business intelligence and analytics. Specifically, the revisions to the course better reflect teaching the students to meet the following objectives: Data collection/extraction/organization: understand and apply tools to collect, extract, organize, and secure data; Data analysis: Use current and emerging technologies to apply descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive analytics to business problems, which includes creation of visualizations; Data interpretation: identify patterns in data through interpretation of statistical analyses and visualizations. Revisions have been made to better provide students tools for business applications working with data, databases and reports from analytic models through coverage of fundamentals of data analysis, data visualization, and inferential statistics, all supporting descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive analytics; Change in course title; Old Value: Intermediate Statistics; New Value: Applied Business Analytics; Change in prerequisites; Old Value: MGT 233 or equivalent; New Value: MGT 233; Change in course description; Old Value: A continuation of the study of the application of statistical techniques to business situations that involves advanced topics such as multiple correlation and regression. A statistical

computer package will be used; New Value: A continuation of the study of the application of statistical techniques to support decision making in business situations using descriptive, predictive, and prescriptive analytics. A statistical computer package will be used.

#148, Alter, Minor, Management Information Systems, CYSY, CBT, Move to the Cyber Systems Department and make use of existing courses in the new department.

#149, Alter, Minor, Software Quality Assurance, CYSY, CBT, Move to Cyber Systems department. Updated course requirements to meet industry standards.

#150, Alter, Minor, Marketing/Management, MKMIS, CBT, Dr. Luthans, Chair of Management, requested that MGT 330 International Management be added to the list of Minor electives. We are also replacing MIS 302 with CYBR 302 in the electives.

---

#### 2018-2019 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Academic Affairs Subcommittee 4/10/2019  
Academic Affairs Full Committee 4/18/2019

NUMBER, REQUEST, LEVEL, SPECIFIC REQUEST, DEGREE/COURSE, PROGRAM/COURSE, TITLE, DEPT, COL, REASON

---

#151, Alter, Course, Prerequisites, AGBS 315, Agribusiness Management, AGBS, CBT, Students need economic principles in AGBS 315. Initially, we assumed that students would have taken both ECON 270 and 271 before taking AGBS 315. We are making this prerequisite change to reflect the needed prerequisites as the initial assumption is incorrect; Change in prerequisites; Old Value: MGT 301; New Value: ECON 270 and ECON 271 and MGT 301.

#152, Alter, Course, Title, Course Description, BSED 402, Career, Business, and Technology Principles, BSED, CBT, The new course title and course description reflects the updated course content required by the Nebraska Department of Education Rule of 24 Matrix change that was approved in 2018 by the state board; Change in course title; Old Value: Automated Office Systems; New Value: Career, Business, and Technology Principles; Change in course description; Old Value: This course examines new and emerging computer technologies. Hands-on experience in desktop publishing and a variety of software programs related to business are provided; New Value: This course examines career and technical development, stakeholder engagement, and new and emerging business and computer technologies to promote learning. Subject integration, application of standards, use of web-based sources and resource management is applied. Hands-on experience in desktop publishing and a variety of software programs related to business are provided.

#153, Alter, Supplemental Endorsement, English As a Second Language, TE, COE, Updated to meet state requirements.

#154, Alter, Course, Prerequisites, MGT 495, Administrative Strategy and Policy, MGT, CBT, MIS 302 has been removed as a required course in the Business Administration (BA) core. Instead, coverage of relevant "information systems" topics will be covered throughout the BA core and in the newly created ECON/IS category. Therefore, MIS 302 or AGBS 335 have been removed as prerequisites for MGT 495; Change in prerequisites; Old Value: FIN 308 and MKT 300 and either MIS 302 or AGBS 335 and either MGT 301 or MGT 355; New Value: FIN 308 and MKT 300 and either MGT 301 or MGT 355.

#155, Discontinue, Course, PE 160, Healthful Living, PE, COE, This course has been redesigned and renumbered to fit the General Studies guidelines.

#156, Alter, Course, Course Description, TE 100, Teaching in a Democratic Society, TE, COE, The Service Learning Project was removed from TE 100. The course description needs to reflect this change; Change in course description; Old Value: The first course for all teacher education majors. The key course themes are democracy, diversity, and technology. Current educational issues will be explored. The course includes a field experience in K-12 school sites and, also, includes a community service learning component. Concurrent enrollment in a matched section of PSCI 110 is encouraged; New Value: The first course for all teacher education majors. The key course themes are democracy, diversity, and technology. Current educational issues will be explored. The course includes a field experience in K-12 school sites. Concurrent enrollment in a matched section of PSCI 110 is encouraged.

#157, Create, Course, TE 424, Teaching English to Speaker of Other Languages TESOL, TE, COE, Meet the state requirements for the soon to be revised and adopted ESL endorsement.



**To:** General Studies Council

**From:** Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee (Ralph Hanson (CAS); Julie Shaffer (CAS); Bailey Koch (COE); Kate Heelan (COE); Brooke Envick (CBT); Debbie Bridges (CBT); Derek Broeckner (FS); Lindsay Brownfield (LIB); Kim Schipporeit (REG); Joel Cardenas (AA); Mark Ellis (AA);

**Date:** March 25, 2019

**Subject:** Proposed Revision of General Studies Program

**Summary of General Studies Responses:**

The Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee (FSAA) was charged with soliciting feedback from across campus about the proposed revisions to the UNK General Studies program and relaying the Committee's recommendation to the GSC by 5 p.m. on April 1, 2019.

Committee members collected feedback through college level meetings, departmental meetings, a faculty senate meeting and campus listening sessions.

Written response was submitted by the Biology, Communication, History, Modern Language, Philosophy, Physics, and Political Science departments. The College of Education and the College of Business and Technology also had representatives submit summaries of their college-level discussions.

Response varied widely from strongly supportive to strongly oppositional. A number of programs, in addition to offering feedback on the proposal, offered their own versions of a revised General Studies program.

The complete text of the responses will follow this summary.

**Supporting the proposal:**

Those supporting the proposed General studies program made a range of points including:

- 37 hours was an appropriate size for the General Studies curriculum.
- Program size provides needed enrollment for numerous programs
- Although the portal and capstone courses were created with educational objectives, there was support for them as a tool for assessment.
- There is a need for entry-level classes for young freshmen and international students.

**Opposition in whole or part to the proposal:**

Opposition to the proposal took a wide range of forms. Note that some of these critiques are at odds with each other:

- Numerous categories of courses should be cut from the program, including portals, capstones, wellness and democracy.
- There needs to be more than one class required in each distribution area.
- There are too many adjuncts teaching General Studies classes.
- The General Studies program should focus more on a classical education.
- Cuts to the program would not give students a full liberal arts education.
- The General Studies Program revision is still too big. It should be cut closer to somewhere between 30 and 34 hours.

- Proposed cuts in the size of the program could lead to a reduction of number of faculty in some programs with low major counts.

**Overall concerns about the General Studies Program not addressed by the proposal:**

- There were not consistent instructions given to departments around the university. Some chose to propose new general studies programs while others simply evaluated whether they could live with what is being proposed. There were also concerns expressed as to whether programs were voting “in favor” of the new program or whether they “could make it work”.
- Too many General Studies classes are being taught by adjuncts
- If Democracy is removed as an independent category, departments need to have an opportunity to apply to have their courses allocated to an appropriate distribution area before the proposed program is put into effect. This might be accomplished by delaying implementation of the program for a year.
- There was not sufficient assessment and enrollment data collected to show that the General Studies program needed to be revised or that the proposed revision would address any shortcomings.

Given these concerns, the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee voted *not to approve* the proposed General Studies revision at this time (March 25, 2019).

**APPENDIX A: STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

The Department of Political Science would like to express our sincere appreciation for the work that has been done by the GS Council to address the demand from faculty to reduce the number of credit hours in our General Studies program. Despite this work, our Department believes that more can and must be done to reduce the program closer to 30 credit hours that would ground students with a liberal arts & sciences foundation. Our position is based on the concerns we all have about declining enrollments as well as our belief that a further reduction would allow for a more enriching educational experience for our students.

First, we view the current General Studies program as not living up to its promise. Criticisms raised about the current program can be summarized as: a) Doubts about the effectiveness of portal and capstone courses; b) Courses approved despite being offered by departments that lack the relevant disciplinary expertise; c) Too many course options in various categories with the result of shrinking class sizes; d) Too much reliance on adjuncts to teach general studies courses; and e) Questions about whether some general studies courses are even designed to serve the general student body.

Second, as stated by Carol Lilly and Maha Younes, UNK's enrollments are in steep decline. President Bounds even referred to it as a "death spiral." Reducing the number of general studies hours makes UNK more attractive, especially in a competitive environment where UNL offers a 30 hour general studies program (the ACE). College- or discipline-specific additional degree requirements could build upon this foundation, as is done at UNL. In addition, reducing hours would allow transfer students from community colleges an easier transition. Even if they elected to do all general studies coursework at a community college, 30 out of 120 hours versus 45 out of 120 hours means more credits at UNK. We know that some advocates of the 37 credit hour proposal suggest that our larger GS requirements serve to distinguish UNK from UNL, but we believe that our small class sizes, number of classes taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty, and our extensive undergraduate research program remain the hallmarks of a UNK education and constitute a wholly positive distinction from Lincoln. More extensive (read: burdensome) general studies is not a distinction working in our favor from the perspective of the students we're trying to recruit.

Third, we remain convinced that reducing general studies hours closer to 30 credits would encourage students to pursue an additional minor, second major, or second endorsement, and/or give them greater flexibility to study broadly via unrestricted electives. Linda Van Ingen effectively reminded us of the educational and professional benefits to our students of second majors: "Students see second majors as a practical career decision, as do their parents". Particularly if paired with a requirement that the second major or minor be from a different discipline, we can ensure that students broaden their education beyond the limits of the general studies program.

Fourth, it has become commonplace for departments to offload their major/minor program requirements into the General Studies Program by requiring students in their programs to take particular courses in the distribution or core categories. (Yes, we have a couple of these in Political Science too.) This practice disadvantages students who change majors or enroll with transfer credit, who then must do additional General Studies coursework above the 45-hours to complete the specific classes prescribed by their (new) major. We believe that a condition of the 30 hour GS Program should be to prohibit those restrictions. If the College or specific departments need their majors to complete additional prerequisite coursework, they should not use the GS Program to that end. Reducing the core GS requirement to 25% of the total degree hours makes room to correct this problem. Departments

would still be free to advise students as to which GS courses they believe would provide the best foundation for their particular areas of study.

Fifth, some advocates for the 37 hour program (or the status quo) have suggested that a greater reduction in hours threatens departments and faculty lines that currently depend on General Studies enrollments. Although self-interest is understandable and anxiety is natural when considering a change like this, a program that serves the interests of departments or faculty at the expense of the best interests of the students is contrary to our mission. Moreover, we think it is difficult to fully anticipate how a program change might affect departmental enrollments in the future. Right now, the General Studies Program's 45 (at least) hours make up such a big chunk of the total degree hours that any departments not included clearly are at a credit-hour disadvantage. But with a smaller GS program, the pre-professional colleges have something to gain from more students being able to do second majors, minors, endorsements, etc. in their programs. CAS departments would have a bigger proportion of the GS credit hours generated in a 30 hour program but there would be fewer hours overall. That would open up additional opportunities for us to teach upper-level courses for students in our majors, minors, subject/field endorsements, and to develop new (and perhaps interdisciplinary) programs that could replace or surpass the credit hours we currently get from General Studies.

We heartily endorse the recent proposal by Maha Younes as well as much of option #2 in the Lilly proposal (with the addition of the *Democracy* course):

#### **Younes Proposal**

Eng. 102	3-6 (depending on ACT)
Oral Communication	3
<i>Math</i>	3
Democracy course	3
Aesthetics	3
Humanities	3
Social Sciences	6
Natural Sciences	4
<u>Capstone</u>	<u>3</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>31-34</b>

#### Option #2 of the Lilly Proposal

Eng. 101 and/or 102	3-6*
(*3 hr additional elective across any category below if Eng 102 only)	
Oral Communication	3
Math	3
Democracy course	3
Aesthetics	3
Humanities	3
Social Sciences	3
Natural Sciences	4
<u>Wellness</u>	<u>3</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>

These two proposals maintain a proper mix of disciplines central to a Liberal Arts education while simultaneously making the necessary reductions to ensure that our General Studies does not place us at

a disadvantage in the state. We absolutely understand that whatever reduction is adopted will necessitate trade-offs, and that some departments almost certainly will end up benefitting more than others. However, we believe that we all must be prepared to adapt to the changing reality. How many departments and programs are currently threatened by declining enrollments, declines that show little sign of reversing? Should we not do everything we can to disrupt this trend before we have more departments called to justify their existence to the Coordinating Commission? As Carol Lilly correctly pointed out: "We cannot teach students we do not have".

Finally, we share the view voiced by some in this discussion that we must act quickly in making our changes to ensure that we can better compete with our rivals sooner than later.

Again, with thanks to the GS Council for beginning this important discussion, we firmly believe that their proposed program does not make the necessary reduction in hours.

**APPENDIX B: A PROPOSAL FOR A CHANGE TO THE GS PROGRAM (FROM THE PHILOSOPHERS)**

We agree with the Political Scientists when they say “the current General Studies program is not living up to its promise.” We also agree with their summary of the criticisms raised about the current program: “a) Doubts about the effectiveness of portal and capstone courses; b) Courses approved despite being offered by departments that lack the relevant disciplinary expertise; c) Too many course options in various categories with the result of shrinking class sizes; d) Too much reliance on adjuncts to teach general studies courses; and e) Questions about whether some general studies courses are even designed to serve the general student body.” We think these are legitimate criticisms. However, we don’t think the proposals they have endorsed will resolve any of them.

First of all, we do not see how any university whose GS program requires only one course in the distribution areas (Natural Science, Social Science, Humanities, and the Arts) can legitimately claim to offer a Liberal Education, or be a Liberal Arts university. A reduction from six to three hours in each of these areas would actually make the problem of the GS Program “not living up to its promise” worse, not better. It would merely show that we are NOT serious about offering a Liberal Arts Education at UNK. Such minimal requirements will do very little to acquaint students with the value of these discipline categories, much less give them any formational habits of thought.

Secondly, the proposals they support retain the Democracy category, which is one of the problem areas under (b) [courses offered by departments that lack the relevant disciplinary expertise] and (c) [too many course options in various categories]. We agree that the Portal and Capstone courses have been rendered ineffective (by falsely presuming that almost any course will develop “critical thinking,” and an extremely vague notion of what counts as “interdisciplinary”), and should therefore be eliminated; the Democracy category should go as well, and for the same reasons. Criticisms (b) and (c) can be addressed directly by limiting the course offerings in each category to only disciplines within that category (I have listed them in the proposal below).

Criticisms (d) [Too much reliance on adjuncts to teach general studies courses] and (e) [Questions about whether some general studies courses are even designed to serve the general student body] can be partially addressed by requiring that at least 12 distribution hours be upper division courses. Adjuncts do not teach upper division courses, and the upper division requirement will help allay the tendency of GS courses to be mere survey courses or repetitions of what the students have gotten in High school. Ultimately, however, these two criticisms need to be addressed at the departmental level.

In the interest of reducing the number of required GS hours (so that students have more opportunity to add second majors or minors), we also suggest that students be allowed to count one distribution area course towards both their major and towards GS. For most students, this would free up 3 hours.

We also agree with Jon Dettman’s comment that “courses in ‘Wellness’ or ‘Democracy’ should not be included in GS. These are categories intended to promote good citizenship and social hygiene, concepts better left for exploration within the traditional disciplines, rather than being predetermined and promoted as goals of education.”

So, here is a suggested GS Program that we believe would be an improvement over the current one and would be more in line with a Liberal Arts Education, while at the same time would reduce the required hours for GS:

**Core:**

Written Communication (ENG 102; ENG 101 would be remedial)	3
Oral Communication	3
Mathematics (College Algebra or above)	3
<b><u>Distribution Areas:</u></b> (at least 12 hours of upper division required; 3-4 hours can also count towards a major)	
Arts (Music, Art, Theater, Dance, Speech)	6
Humanities (History, Literature, Modern Languages*, Philosophy)	6
Social Sciences (Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Cultural Geography, and Economics, which is usually classified as a Social Science**)	6
Natural Sciences (Physics/Astronomy, Chemistry, Biology, Physical Geography, Health Sciences)	8 (both with labs)
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>

This proposal increases the requirement for the Arts category (previously called “Aesthetics”) from 3 hours to 6 hours—a change we would support, but which could probably remain at 3 hours if there is concern to reduce GS hours even more. Similarly, I have proposed that both courses in Natural Science be lab courses. Here, too, the requirement could remain that only one be a lab course. These two non-changes would reduce the total required GS hours to 31. Another option would be to keep the required hours in Natural Science at 7, but add an additional 3 hours of mathematics or statistics—this would bring the total hours to 37.

\*Modern Languages GS courses should have a cultural or literary focus.

\*\*Social Work seems to us to be more of a vocational program than a discipline in the Arts or Sciences, so we are very skeptical about including it as a discipline in the social science category.

**APPENDIX C:** Department of Modern Languages – Statement on the proposed changes to General Studies  
 As part of what we hope will be a comprehensive effort by UNK faculty and administration to address declining enrollments, intra-system imbalances in recruitment resources and priorities, reduced state support for public higher education, and shifting patterns of transfer credit and dual-enrolled credit, the Department of Modern Languages supports the reduction of General Studies hours. We believe such a reduction will also benefit students by facilitating second majors and minors in our programs.

We do not endorse the current proposal from General Studies Council.

As an alternative, we recommend the elimination of Democracy, Wellness, Portal and Capstone requirements, and we oppose the setting of distribution requirements in Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities or Aesthetics below six hours. A minimum of two courses should be required in each of these foundational areas, with a three-hour exemption (from any single area) allowed for majors with an emphasis on Analytical and Quantitative Thought. This would bring the GS requirements down to 33-34 hours: 9 hours in the “core” and 24-25 hours in the distribution areas.

A model:

*Core*

Written Communication (ENG 102)	3
Oral Communication	3
Mathematics	3

*Distribution Areas*

Aesthetics	6
Humanities	6
Social Sciences	6
Natural Sciences	6-7

Analytical & Quantitative Thought	0-3 (with 3 hrs exempted from a single distribution area)
-----------------------------------	---

<i>Total</i>	33-34
--------------	-------



**APPENDIX D: Comments from College of Business and Technology**

We held two one-hour listening sessions last week. Representatives from the Career Center, Marketing/Agribusiness/Supply Chain Management Department, and Management Department were in attendance. Debbie Bridges addressed all questions regarding clarification. No one expressed questions or opinions of concern or disapproval. While the Career Center is not an academic department, we feel their support of this proposal is important. And, they indicated that they have no concerns related to the General Studies proposal as it appears to give students more control in utilizing course credits to their advantage.

**APPENDIX E: General Studies Proposal Feedback – College of Education****Avenue of Solicited Feedback:**

The College of Education solicited feedback from the faculty via multiple avenues. An email was sent to all COE faculty-requesting feedback, each department held a discussion with a GS representative, and departmental feedback was funneled back through Academic Affairs representatives.

**Individual Department Feedback:**Department of Kinesiology and Sport Sciences

## 1. Do we need to Reduce GS?

- a. The KSS Department is not against decreasing GS, however; collectively the faculty in the KSS dept. think that a decrease to 37 hours is both reasonable and sufficient.
- b. A further decrease to 30-31 hours would be detrimental to the KSS department for the following reasons. To get to 30-31 hours would mean cutting 6 hours via either the elimination of Portal and Capstone courses, or removing credits from the distribution area.
  - i. Cutting the Portal and Capstone courses would significantly and negatively impact the department and college in the following ways:
    1. The portal and capstone courses are used extensively for GS assessment. The GS committee should not forget the history that dictated the creation of these courses. The time and energy that went into developing a GS assessment plan was completed due to a failure to assess our general studies program, which was highlighted in the accreditation process. The most recent accreditation review highlighted our GS assessment plan and spoke highly of its merit. To eliminate the portal and capstone courses would force us to develop a new assessment plan in an unrealistic period.
    2. The specific goals of the portal and capstone courses should not be overlooked. The overarching goals of educating students to focus on critical thinking and communication skills allows UNK to produce good citizens entering the state and national workforce. As up to seventy percent of college students do not work in the same field of study as their degree, the multidisciplinary nature of the Portal and Capstone courses are essential for preparing students for an unknown future. The portal and capstone class allow UNK to provide a UNIQUE and meaningful foundation of critical thinking, liberal arts education to produce meaningful citizenship of our graduates. The UNK website has a list of “Advantages of a General Studies Program” ([http://www.unk.edu/academic\\_affairs/general\\_studies/advantages.php](http://www.unk.edu/academic_affairs/general_studies/advantages.php)).
    3. Removing the capstone and portal courses would eliminate GS offerings from several departments in the COE and CBT. Students graduating from UNK, a Liberal Arts Institution, should be well rounded and have courses from all three colleges on campus.
  - ii. Another avenue of getting to 30-31 hours would be removing 6 hours from the distribution area, which some on campus have suggested could be accomplished by the elimination of Wellness from the distribution. Elimination of the Wellness distribution area would be detrimental to the KSS department and the COE
    1. Currently, every student in the COE is required to take PE 150. Removal of the Wellness distribution area would result in the removal of PE 150 from most majors in COE, as most majors do not have room to move PE 150 to

- the major requirements. The faculty in the KSS dept. think this would be a disservice to students.
2. PE 150 provides UNK students with lifestyle education and the basic understanding of social/emotional health and physical health as well as safety. In a world where teen suicide, diabetes, and health care expenditures are increasing exponentially, it is our responsibility to provide ALL students with education to assist them in leading a healthier, safer life while on campus and off. In PE 150 students are introduced to student health directors and discussions on STD's, alcohol, tobacco, reproduction, sexuality, stress reduction, anxiety, healthy eating, and exercise all occur. Resources and information on these and other health related topics are shared in a non-threatening environment. Years of data from student reflections suggest that students report "All UNK students should take this course" and the students report that the class is meaningful and necessary. It is the opinion of the KSS faculty that every student at UNK should have this foundational course to enhance their lifetime health and safety. When PE 150 was developed, an assessment plan with clear and concise outcomes were developed. It is a meaningful, multidisciplinary course with academic integrity that is necessary for all young adults. Although PE 150 is no longer required of all UNK students, it is required of all COE students and the KSS faculty voted unanimously that it is an essential part of the liberal arts curriculum. It is the only course in the Wellness distribution area that covers all six dimensions of wellness.
  3. Other courses in the Wellness distribution area are essential for curricular programs as well as health and wellbeing of students.
- c. The KSS department is also concerned with decreasing GS below 37 hours due to the impact on students with high school dual credit and International Students.
- i. More and more students are enrolling at UNK with 12-24 hours of college credit earned through high school dual credit courses. These students are still 17-19 years of age and we think that many of them are not emotionally or developmentally ready for the rigor of upper division college courses. Decreasing the requirement for GS would allow these students to enroll in upper division major courses as early as the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester of their first year. Previous data from student enrollment has demonstrated that first year students enrolled in PE 310 (for example) struggle more and earn lower grades than students who are in their 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> semester of college.
  - ii. International students will also be at a disadvantage if the General Studies requirement is reduced too much, as the more general studies they can take to adapt and integrate into our community, the more successful they tend to be in their major courses.

#### Department of Communication Disorders

- At the CDIS January 2019 Faculty Meeting the proposed GS changes were discussed.
  - a. Overall, the CDIS faculty was in support of the GS proposal. The following points were discussed:
    - i. For CDIS students, removing the TE 100/PSCI110 tie would be beneficial under the proposed GS program. This would allow our PSY requirements (for ASHA

- accreditation) to be fulfilled within the GS program (students would still take TE 100, but not have the extra PSC hours)
- ii. The financial repercussions of reducing the credit hour productions campus-wide; has this been discussed? What impact will this have globally?
- b. In general, the CDIS faculty supports the proposed GS changes. The following comments were gathered from individual faculty members.
- i. I am in support of the current GS proposal. It supports the students in getting a breadth of knowledge and will not be a determinant to the COE programs.
  - ii. English 101 & 102 should be required. 80% of our students or more have to take it. So again, we're in a situation where it is a hidden requirement. I see that it can count down in the distribution but that seems confusing to me. I think the Wellness category should go away as ALL NE high school students have to have a health class. I know that is unpopular in COE because of course credit production but we're supposed to be looking at the program from what is best for a student. Maybe natural sciences should be 4-8 credits as I don't know how many classes in the sciences that at GS classes are actually 3 credits. I would think most would have a lab.
  - iii. I agree with the proposed changes. In general, I think perhaps a solution to have all programs happy would be a set of Required courses and a set of Electives! In this way, all programs would have to take the Required ones and only those who miss certain courses would take them as electives...

#### Department of Teacher Education

\* Discussion took place during the February 7, 2019 faculty meeting and via email discussions sent out prior to the meeting.

- The majority of the TE Department is in favor of the proposed changes. For those in favor, the following points were discussed.
  - a. TE 100 will move back into the professional sequence and most TE majors will gain 3 hours to use toward another area.
  - b. This will provide transfer students more flexibility.
  - c. This will allow TE programs flexibility to meet Rule 24 guidelines.
  - d. More research and data was needed to make this decision...and none of that has been presented to those of us being asked to provide feedback. Where did this need arise from?
  - e. It's not necessarily a change to the number of hours needed, but more of a reboot to the current course content. More emphasis on critical thinking. Need updates to today's world.
  - f. Flexibility is appreciated.
- Those not entirely in favor of the proposal suggested:
  - a. Reduce analytical and quantitative thought to 0-3. Reduce wellness to 0-3. Revise capstone/portal courses to 2.5 hours each. 37 is brought down to 30.
  - b. "Keep enrollment in mind. It needs to be less than 37."
  - c. Keep where it is. "I believe in having ratified teachers with a well-rounded background in liberal arts."
- Department of Counseling and School Psychology
- \* CSP Department Faculty met on Feb 13, 2019 with GSC Director Bridges, COE Rep Julie Agard and UNK Assessment Beth Hinga

CSP supports the current GSC Proposal reducing GS from 45 to 37 hours. We see a lot of flexibility for all programs in this proposal. We appreciate the work that GSC did by reviewing each program and the change in hours these reductions had on those programs. CSP strongly opposes further cuts to GS overall and especially to portal or capstone courses.

**APPENDIX F: History Department**

History Department Meeting, January 30, 2019

1. The Department discussed the revision proposal by the General Studies Council and passed the following resolution:

“The History Department welcomes the effort to revise the current General Studies program, but we believe the working proposal (37 hours) does not go far enough to enhance student opportunity for both enrichment and career development. A GS program of about 30 hours provides our students with more options to seek second majors or endorsements, minors, or pursue other learning avenues. Such a GS program would be consistent with others, such as that at UNL, and encourage enrollment at UNK.” **The resolution passed unanimously.**

**APPENDIX G: Department of Physics and Astronomy**

**The Department of Physics and Astronomy is not in favor of the proposed changes to the GS curriculum.** The reduction in the required Natural Sciences credits to a single lab class does not address the problem of scientific literacy. This single class might be a dual-credit class, the quality of which varies significantly. The general population is not well-versed in basic scientific knowledge or an understanding of the process of science, and a reduction in Natural Sciences credits in the GS program can only add to that deficiency, even among those with a college education. Over 80% of our department's student credit hour production is from GS courses not taken by our majors. This figure ignores PHYS 275/275L and PHYS 276/276L, and literally no one would enroll in these calculus-based courses to earn GS credit. Requiring all students to take only one Natural Sciences GS course rather than two will have a significant impact on our department. Classes are already small so this will mean a reduction in course offerings, from two sections per semester to one section or from both fall and spring terms to only fall or spring term. Our department is very apt to lose faculty as a result.

**APPENDIX H: Biology Department**

The Biology Department unanimously rejects (17-0) the proposed change to General Studies. We would like to begin by saying that we have only considered the impacts that the proposal will have on student learning and none of the impacts on the department as we feel student academic success is paramount. We have rejected the proposal primarily because we feel that reducing the distribution classes, reduces the breadth and depth of the material to which students will be exposed. We feel that if we want a liberal arts experience, the distribution should remain at current credit expectations. We agree that the Democracy class is not necessary, and we are against placing it in the distribution category which will once again reduce the options for distribution. We also reject the idea that this will allow students to get second majors or a minor. We do not believe the number of credit hours saved are enough to support this argument.



**APPENDIX I:** Department of Communication statement on the proposed General Studies program

- The Department of Communication believes that the General Studies program proposal works to make the University more attractive.
- But the Department also believes that democracy courses need to be incorporated into existing distribution area where appropriate before the new program is implemented.
- The Department expressed unanimous support for these two statements.

(3/4/19)