Liberal Education Program Committee Meeting

Wednesday, September 12, 2012
3:25– 4:45pm – ASC 201

Meeting Minutes

Present: Kim Laing, Liz Keenan, Wendy Hardenberg (recording), Elliott Horch, Astrid Eich-Krohm, Mike Shea, Nicole Henderson, Polly Beals, Deb Weiss (chair), Dave Petroski, Donna Jean Fredeen

- Meeting was called to order at 3:29 p.m.

- Minutes of previous meetings will be approved at the next meeting since a quorum was not present.

- Announcements
  - Polly: During inauguration there will be a panel discussion on the importance of a liberal education for a professional career, which would be good for LEPC members to attend; 9/24 @ 1:00-3:00, ASC Ballroom
  - Kim: Faculty should remember to report students who never attend and withdrawal is no longer okay for financial aid!

- Committee and Ad Hoc reports – update from Psychology (Deb)
  - Education has found its own solution, so they won't need their half of Psychology's two-course solution from the spring
  - Psychology reports that progress has not been made yet this semester, but it's on the docket
  - We still need to resolve whether psych majors can take PSY 100 in the first semester even if it's a Tier 2 course

- Old Business
  - TAP Framework discussion
    - LEPC is tasked with providing the commentary which will then go to UWIC, which will vote and add commentary and send it on to UCF
    - Polly: What was set up makes sense and aligns largely with the LEP except for the oral comm; when will the discussion about how things work on individual campuses begin?
    - Deb: we need to stick to pedagogy and academics right now, especially since several CCs are worried that the learning outcomes are too ambitious for their students
• Nicole: we still have oral comm, it’s just embedded instead of a course
• Deb: the competencies will be very similar, it’s a just a matter of working with the registrar on the course vs. embedded exchange
• Dave: misalignment between CC emphasis on oral comm as a course vs. TF as embedded, where we’re the opposite
• Deb: Gateway may go with a TF course, and that’s one of our biggest feeders, but we just don’t know what any of the CCs will do yet
• Dave: pedagogical concern is about stacking the deck based on current institutional realities; what if we need to accommodate students without any TF competency?
• Deb: If a CC chooses oral comm and CT or social science or whatever, we’d still be able to ask students to do the competencies that are left over
• Dave: we need to think about how we’re able to adequately deliver on a competency in terms of resources (having TF in a computer classroom is pedagogical issue)
• Polly: is there a pedagogical argument for why certain competencies are designated and other embedded? It could seem arbitrary
• Mike: need to use the ambitious goals to ask for the resources from the Board of Regents to meet learning outcomes
• Deb: problem with some CCs concerns with learning outcomes not necessarily resources—could be just an initial reaction to daunting appearance; we can make positive commentary about our support, too!
• Liz: in light of the relationships forming over the summer, is there an influence we would want Southern to have? A way we could move the process forward?
• Deb: first want to hear people’s concerns, both positive and negative
• Dave: an associate’s is assumed in the framework, so how does it work if a student comes in with less?
• Polly: the law says just the associate’s, but why wouldn’t we accept those same credits from a student without the degree? New norms will probably be established that will facilitate transfer
• Nicole: complicated for a student with 6 credits who took oral comm, then
• Deb: state is concerned with degree completion, so that 6-credit student would be treated like any other transfer student
• Nicole: we’ve set up the problem of oral comm being part of a package but not working as a course; we’ve moved beyond just credits in the package, but not outside of it
• Deb: has to be clear for the students that oral comm is not part of LEP, but if they complete the package then they’ve met everything
• Liz: understand intent for degree completion, but it’s not the reality, so we should have equivalencies and make it obvious
• Deb: but we’re only dealing with the package and what the legislature wanted; there are bigger questions, but we can’t solve those problems here
• Liz: just looking out for unintended consequences for students with less than an associate’s
• Deb: we can do that on our own, and we have a lot of transfer issues we need to address; once TAP is through (or independent of TAP), we can consider our issues
• Liz: raise concern of unintended consequences in commentary
• Deb: comment to the effect of “we are pleased with the rigor of the learning outcomes”? plus “concerns about unintended consequences for transfer students without associates degrees”?
• We’ll come back to this next week

○ New Business
• Dean Fredeen
  • Distributed reports and copy of Peer Review related to liberal arts symposium
• Prioritizing of agenda issues for academic year 2012-2013
  • Polly will continue work with the Tier 2 AGs, and she’ll report back to the committee and ask for input
  • Proposal of Tier 3 courses
  • Revising transition courses
    1. How to get the word out better
    2. They really only have one year
• Advising workshops
• Course caps for LEP courses
• Transfer under the LEP
  1. Look at equivalency bank
  2. Talk to academic advisement about AUR vs. LEP
  3. Consideration of transferability under the LEP vs. AUR – Kim will provide sample transcripts with comparisons.
• CT, TF, INQ, and Comp collaborations/conversations?
  Understanding of other courses

• Technology support
• LEP assessment
  • Discussion of Tier 2 course in first semester – Elliott has agreed to follow up spring semester with analysis to compare to the fall 2011 results. Kim will provide the data.
• Meeting schedule
  • Still meet every week? Same time? Another time less often but longer?
Meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.