I. The meeting was called to order at 8:48.
   1. A quorum (50% + 1) was reached at 8:48.

II. Liz Keenan asked the body's permission to begin with New Business—a visit from Provost Kennedy—to accommodate Kennedy's arrival.
   a. The body was amenable to the change.

III. New Business
   a. As Liz Keenan explained in her introduction, Provost Kennedy came to the meeting to discuss recent issues concerning pedagogy, class size and tier 2 courses. Keenan created a document with enrollment numbers in Tier 2 courses during Thanksgiving break. Upon completing the document, which she showed to the body, she contacted faculty members teaching super section courses to determine what, if any, additional resources have been promised for large enrollment Tier 2 sections. She discovered that resource allocations are variable, though most super sections have been promised some extra help in the form of Graduate Assistants who will work for 10 hours a week. After the presentation, Keenan turned the discussion over to Provost Kennedy.
      i. Kennedy informed the body that a Faculty Development Grant will fund a winter session workshop to provide training for instructors and GAs who are assigned to super sections. She stated that she felt that there was significant misunderstanding about class size changes among the faculty, which she noticed at a Faculty Senate meeting she attended. She affirmed that only a small number of changes were made, and all of these occurred in consultations with the Departments. She stressed her desire to have a more reasoned conversation about this
topic. She stated that she conducted a study with data from our own students, and found there is no correlation between class size and student grades. She admitted that grades are not a good measure of student learning, yet student grades are the only data we have at this time to work with. She also stressed that the super section implementation is simply a pilot project, and that work is underway to create an assessment process to compare student learning outcomes in these large sections with those of more traditionally sized classes. She then opened the floor to members of the body.

ii. Mike Shea questioned the use of grades as evidence for justifying super sections. He pointed out that some of the chairs consulted about class size reported feeling pressured by Deans. He reminded the Provost that there is a power dynamic at play when Deans interact with Chairs, and this should be considered when consultations occur.

iii. Karen Cummings pointed out that the Deans’ requests are often perceived by chairs as pressure, and went on to say that the cancelation of low enrollment sections is a significant, and perhaps more important, issue for Departments in the School of Arts and Sciences. She expressed support for the super sections because she acknowledged the need to create efficiencies.

iv. Krystyna Gorniak expressed her concern that super sections change the student/teacher ratio, which is a recruitment device. She asked if there was another way to schedule in dialogue with students.

v. Provost Kennedy explained that we currently have a 14 to 1 student/faculty ratio, which is too low for an institution such as ours, and is already substantially lower than it was 5 years ago. We cannot financially support such a low ratio.

vi. Sean Grace expressed concern about the 10-hour work week, low pay and lack of training and education of the Graduate Assistants assigned to super sections.

vii. Cindy O’Sullivan suggested we find data on student perceptions regarding large classes because some students like super size sections. She also wondered if there is a way that faculty teaching super sections might be compensated with research reassigned time and/or an altered teaching load.

viii. Charlie Dellinger-Pate brought up that many students cannot enroll for spring semester classes until they earn the money during the winter break to pay for said classes. This reality is not considered when classes are canceled.

ix. Patty Kahlbaugh spoke in favor super sections because in Psychology they do not have the staff to cover the number of sections that they once offered. She reminded Dr. Kennedy that
newly created classes for the LEP should not be canceled. She suggested that super sections should be managed to ensure that the newly created courses have enough students to be offered. Kennedy responded that methods for scheduling must be altered now that the LEP is up and running.

1. Keenan said that we could determine the number of needed seats, and then discuss how to divide up those seats.

x. Polly Beals reported that faculty seem to be most concerned with being able to reinforce the competencies and with retention issues.

xi. Jeff Webb expressed concern that if the policy regarding super sections is not clearly stated, we may end up with many sweetheart deals. Kennedy agreed that we need transparency and fairness.

xii. Deb Weiss insisted that there are a disproportionate number of freshmen in big classes because small classes are already filled by the time freshmen register. Some freshmen are taking multiple super section classes in one semester. She expressed concern about faculty workload because some are teaching large sections while others are not. Release time, like that arranged for the History Department members teaching super sections, should be equitable across all departments.

xiii. Kelly Stiver suggested that we create assessment guidelines for the competencies.

xiv. Liz Keenan asked the body to give thought to where we can increase class sizes during the break. This is due to the fact that we have argued for small class sizes at every level of our curriculum, and it is clear that we cannot finance small classes everywhere.

xv. Provost Kennedy closed by saying that she wanted to keep the conversation going, and by wishing everyone a happy holiday.

IV. Approval of the UCF minutes of November 21, 2013
1. Scott Graves announced that he has not signed in at previous meetings, and would like that it be acknowledged that he has attended all meeting this semester.

2. The minutes were approved as corrected.

V. Standing committee reports:
1. NMC
   a. Discussion of the 12/5/13 meeting
   b. **Motion** to approve the following new course proposals:
      i. BIO 215—Animal Behavior
      ii. FRE 415—Sexual Citizenship in the French-Speaking World
      iii. GEO 400- The Geography of Wine
iv. ENV 220—Global Climate Change  
v. REC 364—Event Management Advanced Applications

Motion was approved unanimously.

c. Motion to approve the following revised course proposals:
   i. ITA 210—Italian IV  
   ii. ESC 103—General Geology  
   iii. ESC 104—Geohazards: Impact on the Environment  
   iv. ESC 106—General Oceanography  
   v. EXS 191—Introduction to Exercise Science  
   vi. REC 363—Event Management and Promotion

Motion was approved unanimously.

d. Motion to approve the following revised program proposal:
   i. Science Education and Environmental Studies—Environmental Studies

Motion was approved unanimously.

e. The minutes from the meeting on 12/5/13 were received.

2. WACC
   a. Motion to approve the following W-course proposals:
      i. PSY 208—Sleep: Implications for Mind and Body  
      ii. PSY 484—Comparative Animal Behavior

Motion was approved unanimously.

b. The minutes from the 12/5/13 meeting were received.

3. UWIC
   a. Discussion of the 12/5/13 meeting
   b. Klay Kruczek brought forward a motion from the committee to include dates for a previously passed resolution, which allow for elective credit suspension for some certification programs. The additions to the resolution are indicated below in red.

• Whereas certification programs frequently require significantly more than 120 credits to graduate; and  
• Whereas the School of Education and Nursing Departments are in the process of reevaluating their programs to accommodate the LEP requirements;  
• Therefore, be it resolved that during the LEP transition period (Fall, 2011 – Spring, 2015) the requirement of 12 elective credits for the Teacher Certification and Nursing programs be suspended.

c. The motion passed.

d. Motion to approve the following LEP course proposals:
   i. PHY 200—General Physics I (Tier 2, Natural World I)  
   ii. PHY 210—College Physics (Tier 2, Natural World I)  
   iii. PHY 230—Physics for Scientists & Engineers I (Tier 2, Natural World I)  
   iv. ESC 111—Life through Time (Tier 2, Natural World II)  
   v. MUS 251—Music and Movement in Early Childhood (Tier 2, Creative Drive)
vi. SOC 394—Civic Engagement and Service Learning (Tier 3)

**Motion** was approved unanimously.

e. The minutes from the 12/5/13 meeting were received.

4. **NPIC**
   a. Discussion of the 12/5/13 meeting
   b. Minutes from the meeting on 12/5/13 were received.

5. **LEPC**
   a. Deb Weiss continued to show the body the revisions to the LEP document proposed by the committee (See the meeting packet for the exact language; the changes are indicated in red).
      i. The floor opened for discussion.
      ii. Karen Cummings pointed out the need to discuss what the language in the document means to us collectively, perhaps by creating a glossary.
      iii. Sean Grace proposed we change language about tying class size and safety concerns to reflect both safety concerns and “regulations.”
   b. **Motion** by Klay Kruczek to approve the revisions proposed to the LEP document discussed at this and previous meetings, including the change proposed by Sean Grace to include reference to safety regulations. The motion was seconded.
      i. Mike Shea called the question.
      ii. The **motion** passed.
   c. The minutes of the meeting on 12/4/13 were received.

VI. Announcements:
   a. Liz Keenan announced that at the Faculty Leadership Council, Provost Kennedy expressed interest in coming to UCF meetings on a monthly basis to be able to respond to our questions in a more timely manner. According to our Constitution, Academic Affairs has a representative; thus, Provost Kennedy or her designee is welcome to come to the meetings. She will begin to attend regularly in the spring.
   b. Mike Shea reminded us that the state has money, so we should keep pressuring them to give us appropriate resources, rather than taking on more work.
   c. Patty Kahlbaugh stressed the need for more participation on University-wide committees.

VII. The meeting adjourned at 10:17am.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Resha Cardone
Notifications Management Committee
Minutes
January 21, 2014

Present: C. Hannah (Co-Chair), H. Marx (Co-Chair), S. Grace, J. Gil, C. Resha, J. Ruggiero


Call to Order: 9:40 a.m

I. Announcements

II. Old Business

New Course Proposals
EXS 491 – Internship and Sport Studies
   Motion to APPROVE (J. Ruggiero, 2nd S. Grace)
   Vote: (6-0-0)

Revised Course Proposals

** EXS 492 – History and Principles
   Motion to APPROVE (S. Grace, 2nd J. Ruggiero)
   Vote: (6-0-0)

WMS 356 – Maternal and Child Health
   Motion to TABLE pending response from WMS proposer
   Vote: (6-0-0)

Revised Program Proposals
BA Economics
   Motion to TABLE pending form completion for minor revisions

Adjournment 10: 50
Southern Connecticut State University
Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Meeting Minutes
January 16, 2014

Note: This meeting was held electronically.


Absent: D. Carroll (non-voting)

1) Proposals
   M. Rogers, ANT 335: African Prehistory 8-0-0 APPROVED

Minutes respectfully submitted 1/21/14
Marie Basile McDaniel
Chair of WACC
University-Wide Impact Committee Minutes 01/16/14

Present: S. Graves (co-Chair), M. Hartog, L. Kwak, J. Alexander, B. Rowe, M. Shea, A. Reynaga, L. Bower-Phipps, D. Chevan, K. Stiver,
Absent: K. Kruczek (Chair), P. Beals, T. Rega, J. Mielczarski, D. Risisky, D. Petroski, H. Lockwood, A. Marsoobian

I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 9:55 am (quorum reached).

There are only 4 proposals to consider (under New Business), and we need to have a discussion about the evaluation of proposals (under Old Business).

II. Old Business: Discussion of How UWIC is Evaluating Proposals
Discussion of how UWIC is evaluating proposals. We need to have a discussion about the evaluation of proposals. In particular, some proposers have been complaining lately that (1) UWIC has not been completely consistent from year to year with the evaluation of proposals, (2) while we have been evaluating proposals based on the forms and the LEP document, (3) we have been incorporating our interpretation of the forms/LEP document too often.

General comments:
How to handle Intellectual Foundations (IF) and Writing Competencies (WC) within Creative Drive courses (exempt for the Creative Arts?). The “document” demands that Writing Competency be articulated as a reinforcing activity. Intellectual Foundations also can be accomplished through “exemplars”. Perhaps “Source” need be more broadly defined. In Creative arts, the “piece” often speaks for itself, but should they also submit a reflection on their process, other than notes/journal on their process? Journal/notes may be sufficient if discussions/critiques/analyses take place verbally...

• UWIC will make a motion to LEPC – UWIC needs to create the narrative of the motion. IF and WC in Tier 2 need to be clarified. The “Competency page for WC” in the LEP document should be the guide.

• Creative Drive is significantly different experience and perhaps the IF and WC components need to be operationally defined with flexibility.

UWIC members will review LEP document on competencies prior to next meeting.

III. New Business: Proposals for review

Art 112, 2D Design & Color – LEP Tier 2 Creative Drive
Motion: proposal tabled pending additional info, outline, clarification on WC.

Art 260, Etching, Woodcut, Collograph – LEP Tier 2 Creative Drive
Motion: B. Rowe moves to approve, D. Chevan seconded
Vote: 10 approve - unanimous

Art 261, Lithography & Silkscreen – LEP Tier 2 Creative Drive
Motion: B. Rowe moves to approve, D. Chevan seconded
Vote: 10 approve - unanimous

Psychology 100, Introduction to Psychology – LEP Tier 2 Mind & Body
Motion: L.B-P. moves to approve, M.S. seconded
Vote: 10 approve - unanimous
Exercise Science 380, Sports Psychology – LEP Tier 2 Mind & Body
Motion: D. C moves to approve, B. R. seconded
Vote: 10 approve - unanimous

Environmental Studies 220, Global Climate Change – LEP Tier 2 Global Awareness
Motion: K.S. moves to approve, L.K. seconded
Vote: 9 approve - unanimous

Due to time considerations and late arrival of the following course proposals, they were tabled until the next meeting of UWIC.

Tabled proposals:
Economics 100, Principles of Macroeconomics – LEP Tier 2 Social Structure, Conflict & Consensus
Economics 101, Principles of Microeconomics – LEP Tier 2 Global Awareness
Earth Science 103, General Geology – LEP Tier 2 Natural World – Physical Realm
Earth Science 106, General Oceanography – LEP Tier 2 Natural World – Physical Realm
Italian 210, Italian Language through Culture – LEP Tier 2 Cultural Expression
French 415, Sexual Citizenship in the French-speaking World – LEP Tier 3 Global Awareness, Cultural Expression
Geography 400, Geography of Wine – LEP Tier 3 Global Awareness, Natural World, Cultural Expression, Social Structure...

IV. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 10:55 am.
Graves
New Programs and Innovations Committee

Minutes

January 16, 2014

Present: NPIC Members—Lee deLisle (Chair), Cassi Meyerhoffer, Yunseon Choi, Yilma Gebremariam, HoYoung Ahn, Sara Johnson, Mike Skinner, Mike Knell, Stanley Bernard, Hillary Harper. Also in attendance were: Sharon Misasi and Dan Swartz for proposal review for Sports Studies Major.

1. **Meeting called to order:** Meeting was called to order by Lee deLisle at 9:38 AM

2. **Approval of minutes:** Approved unanimously

3. **Old Business**

   a. Final review of previous proposals
      i. Sports Studies Major proposal
         • Motion to **approve** by Mike Skinner under the condition that EXS 491 AND EXS 492 are approved; seconded by Stanley Bernard; voted unanimously (Abstention: 1)
         • Questions from previous review were addressed. Status of concerns about duplication with existing sport management program were discussed but have not been completely resolved.
      ii. Event Management Minor proposal
         • Motion to **approve** by Mike Knell; seconded by Yilma Gebremariam; voted unanimously.

4. **New Business**

   a. New Major in Sport Management Proposal
      i. Need to fix the several typos
      ii. Will add the following:
         • Under “resources needed” will add: “Additional texts and journals to library.”
         • Will include all emails from departments affected: management; marketing; history; sociology
      iii. Motion to **approve** with corrections by Stanley Bernard; seconded by Mike Knell; approved unanimously (Abstention: 1)

**Meeting adjourned:** 10:47 AM
Liberal Education Program Committee Meeting

Wednesday, January 15, 2014

3:25-4:45 p.m. — Math Conference Room — Engleman Hall

Meeting Minutes

Present: Wendy Hardenberg (recording), Elliott Horch, Beena Acchpal, Scott Graves, Polly Beals, David Petroski, Deb Weiss (chair), Joe Fields, Mike Shea, Michael Ben-Avie, Liz Keenan

• Call to Order: 3:32 p.m.

• Announcements — end to Tier 3 expedited process
  o Anyone with anything in the pipeline needs to notify Polly, but after that the opportunity will be closed due to having plenty of Tier 3 courses,
  o We’ll keep an eye on the numbers and reopen the process if more classes are needed later.

• Committee and Ad Hoc reports
  o Affinity groups — update, Polly Beals
    ▪ No report
  o WAC — no report
    ▪ WAC will report on class size work they’ve been doing

• Old Business — LEP assessment – guest Michael Ben-Avie
  o What is the best way to assess Tier 2?
    ▪ LEPC is a good venue to hash out such questions, and Michael would like to talk about this regularly with us.
    ▪ ConnSCU is also now part of the Multi-State collaborative (MSC) to explore more holistic evaluation, plus of course TAP, so how do we create a coherent whole?
      ▪ How can we use these tools to help us and not duplicate work?
    ▪ We can use CLA to compare AUR seniors to LEP seniors
      ▪ This will be interesting because the LEP has not yet been totally implemented the way it was envisioned...
    ▪ Rotational assessment makes a lot of sense (there is some fatigue)
    ▪ This is a profound cultural/paradigm shift for Arts & Sciences faculty (both in terms of assessment and collaborative work).
    ▪ Perhaps we could ask faculty to describe how they’ve changed their teaching for the LEP as part of the assessment
  o Should LEP assessment be rolled in PRAC? (probably not)
Can Tier 2 be assessed globally?
- Perhaps not a great idea in terms of valuing the work and conversations of the Affinity Groups

Portfolios?
- Original idea was for INQ students to set up portfolios and then later in Tier 3 reflect on how far they've come (emphasis on reflection).
- Portfolios could be the Tier 3 common element.

What is the vision?
- Develop a framework outlining how often we want to evaluate different competencies/areas, and how we want to assess Tier 3.
- Where would we like to be by the end of the semester?
- We probably just need to take the plunge and begin the assessment process, recognizing that things are going to evolve.
  - Michael’s LEP report was intended to provide a start to the process.
- Is it also part of our job to decide how to improve things once we have data?

New Business
- Questions from UWIC
  - #5 in the Written Communication guidelines
    - There is language about rewriting in the document, and the committee rejected a course because all the writing was in essay question; looking for a judgment call from LEPC on this.
  - Problem-based learning
    - A course was rejected due to the problem-based learning being based on multiple choice/true-false tests in the proposal, so it would be good to have a definition of that term.
- Should we consider a WAC-like model where individual instructors are approved to teach LEP courses?

Adjournment: 4:47 p.m.