The Faculty Senate was called to order by Frances McSweeney, Chair, on Thursday, October 12, 2000, at 3:30 p.m. Forty-three (43) members were present, thirty-four (34) members were absent with five (5) vacancies. Six (6) nonvoting members were present.

Minutes of September 28, 2000 meeting were approved as circulated.

Announcements (Information Items)

1. Faculty Senate officers met with the Provost on, September 27, 2000.

2. Faculty Senate officers met with the President on September 27, 2000.

3. Annual Reports from committees are in Exhibit B as follows:

   May 22, 2000
   TO:   Faculty Senate Steering Committee
   FROM:   Extended University Affairs Committee
   Sharon Walbridge, Chair
   SUBJECT:  Year-End Report, 1999/2000 Academic Year

   The Extended University Affairs Committee has had a busy year. Committee members reviewed 9 new program/degree proposals, approving all of them. The first review undertaken by the committee in fall 1999 was review of the Extended Degree Programs Assessment and Program Evaluation for fall 1996- Summer 1998.

   Degree programs reviewed and approved included the following:

   - Joint HA in Hotel and Restaurant Administration with Montana State University
   - Joint School Psychology Certification Program with Eastern Washington University
   - BA in Hotel and Restaurant Administration (Vancouver)
   - Ed.D for School Administrators
   - BS in Manufacturing Engineering (Vancouver/Boeing)
   - BA in Education at Northwest Indian College
   - BA in Education (Tri-Cities)
   - BS in Nursing (Asynchronous RN-BSN)
   - BA in Education -CTEP/Bilingual/ESL (SW Washington)

   There are some common themes and concerns that arose throughout our work this year. These focus on the quality of the educational experience for geographically dispersed programs - are people being stretched too thin in supporting these programs? Are supervision, leadership, and accountability strong enough to give students a quality education? Are there sufficient resources in terms of library and technological support? What assurances are there that needs assessment and budget plans are sufficient to make new degree proposals viable? Two other factors were also of concern - the reliance on adjunct faculty and the potential lack of faculty contact for EDP students.
One small point but a sensitive one for some of the Committee members was the fact that the cover memos from the Assistant Registrar/Academic Affairs Committee that conveyed new degree proposals to the Faculty Senate seemed to omit approval from the Extended University Affairs Committee. Committee members believed they were not being given credit for their work in reviewing new degree proposals.

I want to thank the members of the committee for their hard work this year. These members include David Brody (Spokane), Renee Hoeksel (Vancouver), Darcy Miller (Pullman), Leonard Orr (Richland), Terese Ostrowski (Pullman), Sue Peabody (Vancouver), David Youmans (Prosser), and Bronson Faul (Undergraduate student). The committee did nearly all of its business via email, as it was impossible to find a time to meet even by WHETS. Special thanks go to Brody, Hoeksel, Miller, Ostrowski, Peabody, and Youmans for their active participation and dedicated efforts to review each proposal and get their comments to me in a timely fashion.

**Faculty Status Committee**  
**Annual Report**  
**June 1999- May 2000**

Submitted by Virginia I. Lohr, FSC Chair, 1999-2000,

The Faculty Status Committee (FSC) <http://www.wsu.edu/~fsc> serves to conciliate and adjudicate disputes between members of the faculty and the administration and within the faculty resulting from actions and decisions (such as tenure denials) with the University. Any member of the faculty, including temporary faculty, may bring a problem to the attention of FSC. FSC is also charged to report periodically to the Senate and to the faculty concerning its operations. This report focuses on activities during the 1999-2000 academic year and summarizes cases from the past three years.

FSC is responsible to the faculty. It has nine elected members, each serving for three years. FSC members whose terms expired in 2000 are: Ray Huffaker (Agricultural Economics), Virginia Lohr (Horticulture & Landscape Architecture), and Rob Rosenman (Economics). Members with continuing terms are: Gary S. Collins (Physics), KNona C. Liddell (Chemical Engineering), William C. Davis (Veterinary Microbiology and Pathology), Richard Okita (Pharmaceutical Sciences), Jeanne M. Johnson (Speech and Hearing Sciences), and Amy Wharton (Sociology). Three newly elected members who begin their terms during the 2000-2001 academic year are: Sandra C. Cooper (Mathematics), Karen Peterson (Human Development), and Lori Wiest (Music). KNona Liddell will serve as Chair of FSC for 2000-2001.

The Faculty Status Committee received six new appeals during the 1999-2000 academic year and completed one investigation begun the previous year. These appeals, from non-tenured faculty members in tenure track positions, requested the review of decisions on either non-reappointment (2) or tenure denial (5). All of the appeals included allegations of inadequate consideration, and a few also included allegations of significant procedural errors or of violation of academic freedom.
For this report, the FSC considered the six new appeals received this year along with six cases reviewed during the previous two years. Generalizations may not always hold up under close scrutiny, yet themes or trends from these twelve cases may point to areas of concern to the institution. The number of appeals to FSC has been growing during the past three years, but it is still lower than the typical number received six years ago. The most common decision being appealed to the FSC from Fall 1997 through Spring 2000 involved the non-reappointment of faculty on the tenure-track (80%); appeal of the final tenure decision was the most common appeal in this group. About half of the cases investigated by FSC in the past three years involved faculty located somewhere other than Pullman, and 75% of the appellants were women or minorities: neither percentage is proportional to that among the faculty in general. In 75% of recent cases, the FSC has supported the position of the appellant to some degree. The President's Office has been highly responsive to concerns raised by FSC. In most cases, the President has accepted FSC’s recommendations: this same trend has been mentioned in previous reports. In the few cases where this has not been the case, the President's reasons were understood by FSC members, and we felt that he had given fair and thorough consideration to the issues involved.

Another common theme among the appeals in recent years is the high turnover among immediate and upper level administrators, including chairs, directors, and deans; this was noted in more than 75% of the cases we reviewed. We do not know if this figure is proportional to the number of tenure-track faculty at WSU with new administrators within the last 3-5 years, but we suspect that it is not. The cases we have investigated clearly point to problems that can result from administrative turnover. Administrative changes often bring changes in standards and expectations, and new administrators may be unfamiliar with important WSU policies or procedures. This points to the on-going need for clearly specified tenure and promotion criteria and procedures, as well as regularly available mechanisms for new administrators to learn about WSU's policies and procedures. From our cases, it is clear that such mechanisms could be valuable for all administrators, not just new ones.

The single most prominent theme in recent years involved some form of communication problem, as a major or minor element in the case. Communication problems came in many forms: conflicting messages, changing expectations, misinterpretations, inaccurate information, alternative interpretations, and more. Among the WSU faculty, there is great diversity in terms of thought, scholarship, experiences, expertise, and styles. These differences may present unexpected obstacles for non-tenured faculty. To demonstrate that we value such diversity in our institution and that we understand that "different" is not synonymous with "inferior," tenured faculty should make special efforts to be open to those who approach situations in novel ways. Non-tenured faculty members, likewise, have a responsibility to learn and understand the history and culture of this institution, which has brought us to this point, and should make special efforts to be open to sincere assistance when it is offered. One way to foster these objectives is through effective mentoring programs. The FSC encourages efforts to increase the extent and effectiveness of mentoring at WSU as one way to enhance the effectiveness of the institution.

*****
4. Fran McSweeney represented the Faculty Senate at the Board of Regents meeting on September 21, 2000.

5. Faculty Senate Standing Committees reported committee consideration of the following issues (agenda and previously reported items not included) at the, October 5, 2000 Steering Committee meeting:

   Academic Affairs: Post-baccalaureate Certificate Programs.
   Extended University Affairs: Doctor of Design.
   Faculty Affairs: Regents Professorships, Designation of Faculty Positions and Parking Issues.
   Graduate Studies: Course approvals and Field Based EdD.

Announcements (Reports)

1. Remarks by the Chair.—F. McSweeney

   McSweeney announced President Rawlins has formed the Strategic Planning Organization Committee (SPOC). Robert Greenberg will represent the faculty on this committee. As part of the process the committee is forming nine design teams and are requesting faculty nominations for each. The design teams are:

   1. The undergraduate experience
   2. Research, graduate, and professional education environment
   3. Diversity
   4. Efficiency and effectiveness of university processes
   5. The role of the arts at WSU
   6. Development and use of information technology
   7. Focus on biotechnology
   8. Developing and maintaining a strong consistent public image
   9. Outreach

   McSweeney stated she has been appointed to team 8. Each team will consist of 6 to 8 people. Each nomination must include name, title, design team nominated for and why the person is being nominated. Send nominations to the Senate office or McSweeney. The Strategic Plan will tie directly to the budget and it is important to have a say in what is in the plan.

2. Report from Legislative Representatives.—M. Carroll

   There was no report.

Additions or Changes to the Agenda.

   There were no additions or changes to the agenda.
Agenda Items (Action Items)

1. Nominations and Elections from Committee on Committees to fill vacancies on Faculty Senate Committees Exhibit C is as follows:

FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Committee on Committees submits the following names to serve on the following Senate committee with term beginning immediately and ending on the year indicated. Senators are encouraged to study the Committee Manual along with the vitae of the nominee, prior to the meeting of October 12, 2000. Senators desiring to nominate additional persons from the floor MUST PROVIDE written information about the nominees for distribution before the meeting.

Academic Affairs

F - 2003 RECORDS, Kathryn, Associate Professor, ICNE, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 10 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Chair, Graduate Program Committee; Member IRB; Member of Search Committee for Dean of the Graduate School.

Admissions Subcommittee of AAC

F - 2003 HUTTON, David, Professor, Mechanical and Materials Engineering, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 19 years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Academic Advising and Reinstatement; Catalog Subcommittee; Graduate Studies Committee; 30 years in academia; faculty service at three land grant institutions.

Distinguished Faculty Address

F - 2003 MEINERT, Lawrence, Professor, Geology, Faculty, Graduate Faculty WSU 19 years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Admissions; Legislative Affairs; Former Chair of Faculty Senate; 1994 Honors Distinguished Lecture; 1997 college of Science Lutz Teaching Award; 1999 Motor Board Distinguished Professor Award; 2000 Honors College Medal.

Graduate Studies Committee

F - 2003 NORTON, Grant, Associate Professor, Mechanical and Materials Engineering, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 9 years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: 1981, UK BSc Chemistry, Southampton University; 1989, PhD (Materials), DIC (Ceramics and Glasses), Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine, University of London, UK. Committee Experience – Current: Graduate Studies Committee, MME. Committee Experience – Previous: Chair Graduate Studies Committee MME; Graduate Studies Committee, Materials Science Program.

*****
It was pointed out that Distinguished Faculty Address and Graduate Studies nominees on the ballot had been transposed. Balloting results: Academic Affairs: Kathryn Records, 2003; Admissions Subcommittee: David Hutton, 2003; Distinguished Faculty Address: Larry Meinert, 2003; Graduate Studies: Grant Norton, 2003.

2. Nominations from Committee on Committees to fill vacancies on the Faculty Excellence Awards Selection Committees Exhibit D is as follows:

FROM THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Committee on Committees submits the following names to serve on the following Senate committee with term beginning immediately and ending on the year indicated. Senators are encouraged to study the Committee Manual along with the vitae of the nominee, prior to the meeting of October 12, 2000. Senators desiring to nominate additional persons from the floor MUST PROVIDE written information about the nominees for distribution before the meeting.

**Faculty Excellence Awards Selection**

**Instruction**

F - 2003 MILLER, Darcy, Associate Professor, College of Education, Department of Teaching and Learning, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 10 Years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Chair Department of Teaching and Learning; widely recognized for her teaching.

F - 2003 MITTLEHAMMER, Ron, Professor, Ag Economics, Adjunct in Statistics, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 22 years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: 22 years research and teaching; various Department, College and University committee assignments.

**Research**

F - 2003 CHEN, Shulin, Associate Professor, Biological Systems Engineering, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 5 years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Engineering Curriculum Committee; Paper Award Committee; Aquacultural Engineering Society.

**Public Service**

F - 2003 GASKINS, Charlie, Associate Professor, animal Science, Faculty, Graduate Faculty, WSU 24 years. Relevant Experience and Qualifications: Recipient Faculty Excellence Award for Service; has served on several University, College and departmental committees.

****

Balloting resulted as follows: Instruction: Ron Mittlehammer; Research: Shulin Chen; Public Service: Charles Gaskins.
3. Recommendation from Faculty Affairs Committee to remove the date a faculty member must turn in his resignation Exhibit E from 9/28/00 Agenda is as follows:

MEMORANDUM
TO: Fran McSweeney, Chair, Faculty Senate  
FROM: Eric Spangenberg, Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee  
DATE: September 18, 2000  
SUBJECT: Resignation Date in Faculty Manual

At the Faculty Affairs Committee meeting of September 14 the Committee discussed the March 15 resignation date that is in the new Faculty Manual on page III.33 F.2. Resignation. It was pointed out during the discussion that WSU does not make all offers by the March 15 deadline so how can other institutions be expected to do the so. The Committee is recommending dropping the March 15 date. The new paragraph reads as follows:

“Our member of the faculty with teaching responsibilities who has decided to terminate services with the University is expected to notify his or her Dean in writing at the earliest possible opportunity, but no later than March 15.

Motion carried.

4. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for a Certificate in International Business Economics Exhibit F from 9/28/00 Agenda is as follows:

MEMORANDUM
TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Bonnie Collins (for Graduate Studies Committee)  
SUBJECT: Graduate Certificate in International Business Economics  
DATE: 9/19/2000

At its meeting on September 19 2000, the GSC recommended approval of the proposal for a Graduate Certificate in International Business Economics with the following amendment

Under Academic Standards’, remove all wording except for the first and last sentences.

Attachment
Cc: K.P. DePauw  
H. Grimes

Graduate Certificate in International Business Economics

Need for the Program
Businesses in Washington and around the world increasingly find themselves competing in an international economy. Managers and administrative personnel in multinational firms especially, but also in local and regional firms, find that an understanding of international business economics is imperative if they are to
effectively operate in the international marketplace. The Certificate in International Business Economics (CIBE) is targeted towards meeting the training and educational needs of administrative and managerial professionals to prepare them for working in the international business environment. Students in the CIBE receive training in the tools of economic analysis with applications in international business. The Graduate Program Director in Economics will have primary administrative responsibility for the CIBE.

A particular target of the CIBE are international students at foreign universities who are looking for some level of experience and education at an institution in the United States, without incurring the cost of a full degree. In fact, the CIBE was developed in response to requests from foreign universities, Khon Kaen University (KKU) and the University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce (UTCC), both in Thailand, for some opportunity for their students to study at WSU. Most likely students from those institutions will transfer the credits earned at WSU to their degree programs, while also earning the Certificate from WSU. It is expected that students from other foreign universities may also transfer the WSU credits to degree programs in their home countries. Thus, while it will be possible to earn the CIBE through enrollment in courses during the regular academic year, we hope to also offer the CIBE in a during summer sessions at WSU.

Although the immediate target audience consists of international students, the CIBE should also find an audience among business professional in the Pacific Northwest who can arrange sufficient leave time to take the requisite coursework. Structuring the CIBE to fit into the two 6-week summer sessions makes this all the more possible.

**Program Development**

Robert Rosenman, Graduate Program Director in Economics is the primary developer of the CIBE. He received input from other economics faculty, faculty in the College of Business and Economics, especially from International Business, and faculty and administrators at KKU and UTCC. Because students will come from among business practitioners or from graduate programs in business or economics at foreign universities they will have already fulfilled prerequisites for the courses included in the CIBE. Students will not be allowed to register for courses for which they have not fulfilled the prerequisites. The list of supportive electives meets the needs of business training, but the choice is flexible enough to allow students to meet specific interests or needs.

**Certificate Structure**

The CIBE requires 13 credits, including (a) a core of 7 credits consisting of Managerial Economics, a seminar in International Business Economics, and International Trade; (b) an elective in International Business Economics (3 credits); and (c) a supporting business elective (3 credits). Although students may opt to enroll in the CIBE during the academic year, it is designed so that it can be completed in one summer, with two 3-credit courses taken during each of the two 6-week summer sessions at WSU, and an additional 1 credit seminar course taken during one of the summer sessions. We anticipate offering it during the summer, directing the program to international students, but allowing anyone qualified and
interested to enroll, For the summer program the time of study will span from early
May to early August. Students will choose five courses according to the following
outline. Not all courses may be offered each summer, but a sufficient number will be
offered to make it possible to earn the certificate during a single summer. Courses
marked with an asterisk (*) are required and will be taught when the summer CIBE
is offered.

**Required Economics core:**
- *Economics 470: International Trade. (3 credits)
- *Economics 592: Economics for Decision Making (Managerial Economics). (3
  credits)
- *Economics 593: Seminar in International Business Economics (new course). (1
  credit)

**International Business Electives (choose one):**
- International Business 580: International Business Management. (3 credits)
- International Business 581: International Finance. (3 credits)
- International Business 582: International Marketing. (3 credits)

**Supporting Business Elective:**
- An approved graduate course in business. Suggested courses include:
  - A second course in International Business. (3 credits)
  - Accounting 533: Administrative Control. (3 credits)
  - Decision Sciences 591: Statistical Analysis for Business Decisions. (3 credits)
  - Finance 526: Financial Decision Making. (3 credits)
  - Management 593: Organizational Behavior. (3 credits)
  - Marketing 506: Marketing Management and Administrative Policy. (3 credits)

The Seminar in International Business Economics is a new course. A one-credit
course, it meets the equivalent of 15 contact hours. Topics will require that the
student apply the tools of economic analysis to problems in international business,
structured around student participation and projects. The purpose of the course is to
integrate and apply the tools from the other two core courses to problems in
international business. Different topics will be covered, depending on the interest of
the instructor. Example topics include: "International Monetary Policy and
Exchange Rate Behavior"; "Transfer Pricing in the Multinational Firm"; "Exchange
Rate Arbitrage", and "Purchasing Power Parity and Exchange Rate Risk."

**Admission Requirements**
Students will be hold to the same requirements as normal students in graduate
programs in Economics at WSU, except that the GRE requirement will be waived.
Foreign students without a degree from an American university will need a TOEFL
score of at least 550. Students need a baccalaureate degree from an accredited
college or university, letters of recommendation, and a 3.0 grade point average
(GPA) in upper division undergraduate coursework or 12 hours of graduate work.
Provisional admission may be granted by the Graduate School to a student whose
GPA is below 3.0, provided the total record indicates a high probability of success
in the CIBE and the program justifies the student's admission.
Student Status Classification
Students will enroll as Not Advanced Degree Candidates (NADC). Students in the NADC classification must pay graduate fees and must be admitted to a graduate department or program. It is anticipated that they will be admitted to the Department of Economics with NADC status. Students may be admitted with less than a 3.0 GPA, but they must maintain a 3.0 GPA once admitted. Admission as NADC does not obligate the department/program to admit the student to a degree program at a later date. These students may take any course for which they have the necessary prerequisites except those at the 700- or 800- level. A maximum of 6 hours of graduate coursework with grades of "B" or higher (9 for non-thesis master's and doctoral degree) earned under NADC classification may be applied to graduate degree requirements. Time limits on the coursework are the same as for transfer credit.

Academic Standards
Students in the GIBE will be hold to the general academic standards for a degree as set by the Graduate School. Failure to meet these standards will result in termination from the CIBE.

Commitment of Resources
No new resources are anticipated for the CIBE. All but a one-credit course of the courses are already taught, and those taught during summer session must meet the college and university requirement for self-sustaining summer school programs. The new one-credit course, Economics 593, will be taught by existing regular faculty in Economics. Since it is a one credit course, the opportunity cost in teaching alternative classes is minimal. When taught in the summer, it also is subject to the college and university requirement of self-sustaining summer programs.

Library Resources
Library resources sufficiently incorporate the breadth of topics covered under the CIBE. All but one credit of the course is made up of existing courses, and new course focuses on integration and application of tools learned in other courses. Existing library materials are adequate for the additional student load. Needs of the new course are also sufficiently covered by existing materials. A Griffin Search of the WSU libraries for the phrase "International Business Economics" resulted in over 100,000 entries with one of these words in the keywords entry, 904 with both "Economics" and "Business" and 132 entries with all three words in the title.

Endorsements
Robert Rosenman, Graduate Program Director, Economics
Duane Leigh, Chair, Department of Economics
James McCullough, Director, International Business Institute
Glenn Johnson, Dean, College of Business and Economics

*****

Motion carried.

5. Recommendation from Graduate Studies Committee for dropping the MS in Geological Engineering Exhibit G from 9/28/00 Agenda is as follows:
MEMORANDUM
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Bonnie Collins (for Graduate Studies Committee)
SUBJECT: Master of Science in Geological Engineering
DATE: 9/14/2000

At its meeting on April 18 2000, the GSC recommended approval of the request from the Department of Geology to drop the Master of Science degree in Geological Engineering due to low enrollment.

cc. K. P. Depauw         H. Grimes

*****

Motion carried.

6. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for the Western Governors University Transferable AA Degree Exhibit H from 9/28/00 Agenda is as follows:

MEMORANDUM
TO: Thomas Brigham, Executive Secretary
    Faculty Senate
FROM: Becky Bitter, Academic Governance Coordinator
FOR: Academic Affairs Committee
DATE: 20 September 2000
SUBJECT: Proposal to Accept the Western Governors University Transferable Associate of Arts Degree

At its meeting on 5 April 2000, the Academic Affairs Committee approved a proposal to accept the Western Governors University transferable Associate of Arts degree, to be effective fall 2000.

The mission of the Western Governors University transferable A.A. degree is to meet the needs of place- and time-bound students by providing them with the opportunity to complete a competency-based degree. Students participating in the program take courses online, plot out a course of study along with an advisor, and take assessment examinations to determine competency in particular fields of study. Competency is based on assessments over time and a portfolio of work that the students select with the help of their advisors. Students holding the Western Governors University A.A. will have their lower-division GERs waived and receive 44 transfer credit hours. It is anticipated that the number of students who will come to WSU with the degree is small, less than ten per year.

AAC members agreed that accepting this A.A. would be in keeping with fulfilling the university’s mission as a land grant institution—to increase access to education. Members also agreed that after a period of three years, or after 30 students have matriculated to WSU with the Western Governors University A.A., that the agreement should be evaluated to verify that these students are doing as well as other students who come to WSU with A.A. degrees.
At this time, Faculty Senate review and approval of the Western Governors University transferable Associate of Arts degree is recommended.

WESTERN GOVERNORS UNIVERSITY - AA PORTFOLIO COMPONENT
VERSION 1.1

Introduction:
In order to meet the requirements for the Associate of Arts (AA) degree at Western Governors University, students must complete the assessment battery for a number of domains. In order to demonstrate that they can connect the competencies demonstrated in the domain assessment batteries students are required to compete a portfolio exercise. This document describes the portfolio requirements.

As described in the AA degree curriculum, the Portfolio Domain has three basic purposes (as outlined in Design for an Assessment Process for the WGU Associate of Arts Program document approved on May 11, 1998). These purposes and how the proposed design will address each of these purposes are outlined below.

1. To ensure that adequate disciplinary exposure and experiential engagement has occurred. Assessments alone may not be able to demonstrate that the student has engaged in the kinds of experiences or tasks that should be expected of all college-educated individuals. Examples include completion of a sustained piece of research-based writing, direct participation in a laboratory experience, or reading and commenting upon lengthy pieces of writing. As a result, the "portfolio component" will contain a number of required types of exhibits that are intended to directly demonstrate that the student has engaged in such experiences or has actually acquired skills in particular ways.

To address this point, students will refer to work in completing the essay requirement related to the pursuit of the WGU AA degree. The Portfolio will remain with the candidate throughout their WGU experience.

Between the design stage and the implementation, assessments were developed that addressed many of the concerns listed above. This will allow the portfolio requirement to focus on student's ability to integrate their learning and assessment experiences in a focused manner, building on the work of the Collegiate Level Reasoning and Problem Solving Domain.

2. To provide additional ways to assess mastery in particular sub-domain areas (as noted above) the "portfolio component" will contain exhibits that demonstrate mastery of the writing process above the foundational level as part of their certification for Collegiate Reasoning and Program-Solving Skills. In this case, the required exhibit in the "portfolio component" will contain at least one piece of writing involving substantial revision and multiple drafts, together with appropriate reflective commentary. The "portfolio component" also provides students with an opportunity to demonstrate mastery of some established competencies by presenting exhibits not related to formal academic work or not explicitly demonstrated through assessment.
To address this point, candidates will select pieces to be referenced in their integrative essay. Any piece referenced by the integrative essay will be contained in their portfolio. Students will also be encouraged to submit drafts of their essay to their advisor/mentors as they are preparing the integrative essay.

3. To provide a culminating demonstration of the student's ability to integrate knowledge and skills learned throughout the curriculum. All "portfolio components" finally submitted for a degree will include an integrative essay by the student that addresses the reasons for including each exhibit, what was learned in each instance, and the relationships among the pieces in the AA Dossier.

The AA Dossier will contain an Integrative Essay designed to illustrate the relationship among the portfolio selections and the student's ability to relate the knowledge and skills learned throughout their WGU experience.

**Integrative Essay**

Each WGU student will produce an Integrative Essay that ranges in length from 1250 to 2500 words. The resulting essay will be scored on the criteria contained in the attached rubrics. Each WGU student must obtain an acceptable score on each of the dimensions in order to complete this component of the AA degree.

Task: The student will be asked to write an essay integrating the work completed as part of their WGU AA degree with their response to the following question. The student will be required to make reference to at least four different selections contained in the Portfólio. These four selections must represent at least three different disciplines (natural science, social science, humanities, history, or fine and performing arts). Students will respond to the following prompt:

"Describe a choice you made in the past and summarize some of your consideration in coming to that choice. Revisit that choice in light of who you are and what you know today, explaining how and why the choice would be modified or reaffirmed?"

The student will be instructed to develop the integrative essay over time, with the help of their advisor/mentor. The resulting essay will be scored on the following dimensions: Focus, Integration, Audience, Organization and Coherence, Support, Complexity, Clarity, and Professional Presentation. The WGU student must demonstrate an acceptable level of performance on each dimension to complete the AA Dossier component of their degree.

**Scoring Rubrics**

**Focus:**

- **Acceptable:** The essay focuses on a choice made in the past and reflects on considerations in coming to that choice. The writer also revisits that choice in light of who they are and what they know today, explaining how and why the choice would be modified or reaffirmed. Every paragraph in the essay relates in some way to that focus.
- **Unacceptable:** One or more paragraphs are not related to that focus.
Integration:
- Acceptable: The writer explains in some detail the interrelationships among various exhibits and between each of the exhibits and the choice she or he is discussing. Interrelationships go beyond "this contributed to my choice" and "this contributed to my choice," to tell HOW each exhibit, or the thinking that it represents, contributed to his/her choice, and how the different exhibits relate to one another. These relationships may be developmental (each contributed to my growing knowledge/unease/conviction in such and such ways), contrastive (this exhibit shows one point of view; this shows another point of view about my choice), or may exhibit other complex relationships.
- Unacceptable: One or more of the exhibits are not related to one another or to the topic choice, or they are related merely as a list (this contributed and this contributed) without explanation, or with very thin explanation, of how the exhibits contributed or how they are related to one another and to the choice.

Audience:
- Acceptable: the tone, style, and diction are generally appropriate to an audience of faculty mentors.
- Unacceptable: the tone, style, and diction are extremely convoluted, hyperacademic, or, on the other hand, couched in slang or informal language inappropriate for an academic audience.

Organization and coherence:
- Acceptable: The reader can follow the writer’s main points and could make a written outline of the essay. The points follow one another in a reasonable sequence, with appropriate transitions.
- Unacceptable: The reader cannot follow the writer's main points and could not make a written outline of the essay. There is more than one passage whose relationship to the line of reasoning is unclear.

Support:
- Acceptable: the writer supports his or her points with ample reasoning, evidence, concrete details, and/or illustrations from the exhibits. Most support is relevant to the points the writer is trying to make.
- Unacceptable: Points are supported thinly, or support is irrelevant in more than two passages.

Complexity:
- Acceptable: In at least three passages, the writer considers various ways of viewing the choice, various ways of acting, or counterarguments against his/her position or decision. The writer conveys a recognition of the complexity of choice and action in the world.
- Unacceptable: The writer presents a simplistic choice or presents the choice in a simplistic way. The writer views issues and choices from a dualistic perspective (using Perry's scheme). There are fewer than three passages in which the writer considers various ways of viewing the choice, various ways of acting, or counter-arguments against his/her position or decision.

Clarity:
- Acceptable: The reader can clearly understand the writer's meaning.
- Unacceptable: Three or more passages are unclear in their meaning.
Professional Presentation

- Acceptable: The exhibits need not be rewritten (for example, a handwritten diary entry may be left as it is). However, the exhibits are neatly organized and clearly labeled so the reader can easily find them as they are referred to in the essay. The essay itself is neatly typed and uses edited standard written English, with few departures.

- Unacceptable: The exhibits are not well organized or not labeled. The essay is not typed or not neat. Or departures from ESWE are distracting to the reader.

Directions for Students
In order to meet the domain assessment requirements for the Associate of Arts degree, you are required to write an integrative essay an integrative essay of 1250-2500 words. The purpose of this essay is to demonstrate that you can bring together your past learning from different disciplines, fields and areas of study, and experiences and can apply that in an integrative way to a significant question or issue. By past learning, we mean any formal coursework but also the out-of-school experiences, reading, work, or experimentation that contributed to the knowledge, skills, and judgment you needed to achieve your WGU degree. By integrative, we mean can you show how knowledge from one discipline/field/area/experience relates to knowledge in other disciplines and how all of it is related to the issue or question you choose to address.

The question you are to respond to is:

"Describe a choice you made in the past and summarize some of your consideration in coming to that choice. Revisit that choice in light of who you are and what you know today, explaining how and why the choice would be modified or reaffirmed?"

By choice, we mean a decision to act in one way rather than in another way or a decision to change your way of viewing something. (note: you can consult with the advisor/mentor if the question you are considering is appropriate.) Your essay must integrate at least four "exhibits" that represent your past learning. These should come from different disciplines. For example, an exhibit might be a paper or presentation you wrote for an academic course, a proposal you wrote in your job, a calculation, demonstration, or other product of work, leisure, or school (or a description of that product), a diary or journal entry you wrote, something you read, or the like. You will discuss with your advisor/mentor the kinds of exhibits that make most sense given your particular learning history and topic. Choose exhibits that will help to demonstrate the points you want to make in your essay. Your essay must refer to all of the exhibits in an integrative way, showing how they relate to one another and how they influenced or played a role in the choice you made.

Your audience is faculty members who are interested in whether you can integrate your past learning and your WGU experiences in a thoughtful way. You do not need to write in a jargonistic or highly academic way. Write in a straightforward and direct way, as you would to a trusted mentor, about your thoughts and experiences. Your essay will be evaluated on the following criteria. You must pass each of the criteria in order to pass the essay. Your advisor/mentor can share with you what is considered acceptable or unacceptable for each of these criteria.
• Focus
• Integration
• Audience
• Organization and Coherence
• Support
• Complexity
• Clarity
• Professional Presentation

Once your essay is complete, you will submit it, your original plan, and any drafts to:

Director of Assessment
Western Governors University
1059 Yosemite Street, Building 758, Room 249
Aurora, Colorado  80010

*****

Concerns were raised about the lack of quality control, the lack of a lab science requirement, and the fact this degree only transfers 44 credits. Concern was raised over the fact that no western university is associated with this degree.

Motion failed.

Agenda Items (Discussion Items)

1. Recommendation from Academic Affairs Committee for Undergraduate and Professional Major Change Bulletin #1 (Exhibit E).—S. Wherland

The discussion of the Major Change Bulletin focused on a series of technical skills courses in MIS. Where is the money coming from to add this many MIS courses? Greenberg stated they are self-supporting. The purposes of the courses are to provide background for various professional certifications within information systems. The advantage for the student is they can work on technical certification while working on their BA, which in turn helps with enrollments. In larger cities students can take these courses in other places so they will have their technical certification when they graduate. Here in Pullman students don’t have that advantage, and adding these courses will help as a recruiting tool. When taken elsewhere these courses generally cost between $200-$300 each. If a student takes them at WSU the cost would be covered in their tuition. More documentation on funding will be provided for the next meeting. What is the need for these courses? At the present time they are offered on a temporary basis and a majority of the classes are full and some have had to turn students away. Recruiters value this technical certification. If there are more students recruited to business because they can take this certificate program it will generate more FTE. Students would take this in addition to their 12 to 15 hours per semester and these courses will not apply to their degree.
Constituents' Concerns

There were no constituent’s concerns.

Adjournment.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Thomas Brigham
Executive Secretary