Present: Polly Beals, John Daponte, Joe Fields, Wendy Hardenberg, Marty Hartog, Nicole Henderson, Eliott Horch, Rich Kustin, Kim Laing, Wesley O’Brien (recording), Elsie Okobi, Jim Tait, Deb Weiss (Chairperson)

Minutes of 11/16/11 minutes approved with one change.

The committee scheduled an additional meeting for Wednesday 12/14, 12:00-4:00. The provost will provide lunch.

Exemption Policy

The committee took up the issue of creating an exemption policy.

Jim argued for a comprehensive solution for departments with students unable to graduate in 4 years because of credits added by the LEP. Flexibility is mandated by the LEP document.

It was suggested that some departments should be encouraged to reexamine their programs for possible credit-load reduction. On the other hand some members expressed discomfort because it is not within the committee’s purview to suggest program revisions.

John felt it was important to discern to what extent LEP is responsible for extended graduation times. He suggests that departments seeking exemptions should provide explanation of LEP’s responsibility.

Deb felt exemptions are not appropriate for programs without credit issues, and that the request for an exemption by NUR, as it was presented, is not based upon the LEP causing undue difficulty with regard to students’ timely graduation.

A possible solution to Nursing’s concern regarding redundancy would be to certify a NUR course as an LEP course in Mind and Body. Nursing students could be required to take the NUR T2 Mind and Body course to fulfill their requirement.

John suggested that we need guidelines to identify what constitutes a “credit-heavy,” program, and Wes suggested that a working definition would be based on a department’s
demonstration that students are unable to complete a program in 4 years as a result of credit-load imposed by the LEP.

Nicole pointed out that the ability to graduate in 4 years often depends on necessary developmental courses.

Wes raised a larger concern with regard to the Board of Regents looking askance upon LEP if it extends graduation times. Administration has indicated that the BOR could determine that the program is not in the best interests of CT. Jim pointed out that Dean Fredeen has indicated precisely this concern and has suggested that if a single model is adopted for the entire system, that our LEP must be that model.

It was suggested that because the credit problem seems specific to education programs requiring certification, that it would be helpful if PSY could propose an alternative to PSY 370’s prerequisite requirement. Jim suggested that Dean Fredeen might be asked to approach PSY with this possibility.

**Concerns Brought Forward by World Languages and Literature (WLL)**

WLL Chairperson Elena Schmitt joined us to discuss resource issues and proficiency requirements.

**Proficiency Issue**

Deb called our attention to the motion provided in the agenda regarding the LEP document language for T1 Multilingual Communication. The motion follows:

The Multilingual Communication Key Element for Language Proficiency will be modified as follows:

From: Language Proficiency - Participating in interpersonal, presentational, and interpretive modes of communication at the following levels as defined by the standards of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL): western language – intermediate mid; non-western language intermediate low.

To: Language Proficiency - Participating in interpersonal, presentational, and interpretive modes of communication at the following levels as defined by the standards of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL): western language – intermediate low; non-western language novice high.

The brief discussion that followed focused on clarifying the way credits are granted with regard to when the STAMP test is taken. Although students receive 3 credits if they
successfully take the test to waive the 200 level language requirement, they do not receive an extra 3 credits when they take the test as part of the 200-level requirement.

This concern was nonetheless somewhat removed from the actual motion, which is about changing the levels that the student is required to reach.

The motion passed unanimously

**WLL Resource Issue**
The LEPC is working to draft an academic impact statement to bring to UCF with regard to providing WLL the resources necessary to facilitate offering adequate sections and selection.

Elena outlined a number of the most pressing issues facing the department. These include:

- Room availability—the need for additional space.
- Difficulties accommodating the University’s scheduling constraints.
- Staffing issues—Most sections of SPA and FRE 200 are taught by adjunct faculty. Using adjunct faculty to bring students to proficiency levels is an area of concern.
- Lack of necessary support to develop a more appropriate placement exam. Self-placement has been woefully inaccurate, creating frustration and costing students time. Although there are commercially available placement tests, it is unacceptable to ask students to pay for placement exams.

John asked after the adequacy of language labs and tech support for those labs.

Elena indicated that there are 2 labs and that WLL could put another to good use. She suggested another possibility would lie in creating a virtual language lab which could be utilized by students off campus.

After further discussion, the committee began working to draft a resolution to bring to UCF.

Marty suggested that the resolution contain language to remind administration that they have committed to provide LEP necessary resources.

Elsie suggested the need for specificity.
Eilott suggested that resources for WLL should be positioned as an *initial* problem—which is to say that it is not the only problem presented by inadequate resources.

It became clear that drafting the resolution as a whole committee would be overly cumbersome. Deb and Polly volunteered to work on the language for the resolution and to provide it to the members.

**Exemption Policy: The Sequel**
The committee returned to the discussion regarding exemptions.

The committee wondered whether or not the departments seeking exemptions had met yet, and Wes asked if we could inquire as to their progress in drafting some kind of a global solution that would meet their needs.

Polly pointed out that NUR is the only department that has specifically requested an exemption.

Committee members noted that in the effort to reduce credits, an exemption is only one possible solution. Other possibilities need to be explored. Deb asked Marty if Nursing was waiting for/expecting a formal answer regarding their request, and Marty indicated that he is going to meet with them and ask.

Nicole and others noted the committee's agreement that the exemption process should be limited to credit-heavy programs who demonstrate that there is no other way to address the problem.

Committee members felt that Nursing's request was not based specifically on having too many credits imposed by the LEP.

Nicole agreed to draft a qualifications list as a starting point for creating a policy, e.g., students are unable to graduate in 4 years due to too many credits required by major, Department has worked with the LEPC Director to find alternatives, etc.

Committee adjourned at 4:47pm.