Liberal Education Program Committee Meeting
Wednesday, March 28, 2012
3:25– 4:45pm – ASC 308
Meeting Minutes

Present: Wendy Hardenberg (recording), Kim Laing, Deb Weiss (chair), Elliott Horch, Wes O’Brien, John DaPonte, Elsie Okobi, Rich Kustin

- Meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.
- Minutes of the 3/14/12 meeting were approved.
- Old Business
  - *Continuation of discussion on allowing one Tier 2 course in first semester of freshman year
    - Discussion was tabled until Kim has had time to pull the data together and Joe has done some analysis
- New Business
  - Housing of FYE – integration of INQ 101 in LEP document
    - FYE is now up for official approval after having been a pilot program for five years, and the LEPC has been charged with discussing where the program should be housed (whether under the LEPC or elsewhere)
    - Discussion was tabled until Nicole can be present
  - Update of LEP document (see attached LEP document and resolution regarding the process to amend the LEP document). Points discussed by committee members included:
    - The document refers to the concept of “major restructuring” without defining it, so the LEPC needs to decide what should and should not be considered “major.”
    - Would the resolution defining “major” have to go up for faculty referendum as a “major” change?
    - Although the current version of the resolution defines the revision of the number of credits, competencies, and areas of knowledge as non-major, people did advocate for credit requirements and certain competencies, and so those changes could be considered “major.”
    - The LEPC is initiating a process wherein we form a coherent opinion that can then be brought up the chain to start a discussion.
    - We do have a need to be flexible because of the changes occurring in the state—perhaps we can differentiate between key elements (minor) and whole competencies (major).
    - Perhaps we should look for precedents and what other institutions do when changing their general education programs.
    - We could establish a process that would be the same for both major and minor changes, and let people at other levels deal with the question of whether something is major or not.
    - Non-exhaustive lists of both major and minor changes could help.
    - A working definition could be that “major” changes are structural or philosophical in nature, while “minor” changes are based on implementation.
    - The LEP document does not contain any clause about how to enact major change, so UWIC and UCF could check and balance the LEPC.
    - The UCF constitution uses the “major change” language as well, in terms of revising general education.
    - Pushing off the defining of “major” to a higher body would not constitute doing our job; we must be transparent to the best of our ability in defining what a “major change” would be.
    - If we can define “major change”, then everything else is an implementation change.
    - Should the change document or the LEP document changes go forward first? This question will be taken up at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.