UCF Meeting Minutes
February 11, 2016


I. Call to order
Called to order at 9:35 am. A quorum (50% + 1) was reached at 9:35 am

II. Announcements
a. Memo was sent to outgoing Provost Bette Bergeron from UCF thanking her for her work and collegiality. She replied with warm thank you to UCF community.
b. Appointment of Writing Director announced yesterday. Liz continuing to talk with Associate VP Ilene Crawford and Provost on behalf of UCF regarding clarity on process and resources. Stay tuned.
c. Dr. Richard Kustin (School of Business) recently passed away – moment of silence in his honor. School of Business is organizing a fund through the Southern Foundation in his honor if anyone would like to contribute.

III. Approval of UCF minutes of January 28, 2016
A. Correction: Remove Kate Bendrick’s name from absence list
B. Minutes approved with above correction

IV. Standing Committee Reports
A. NMC – Notifications Management Committee
   1. Motion to approve Revised Course Proposals

   HIS 239 - Spain and Portugal
   NUR 443 - Nursing Capstone

   Motion approved unanimously
2. **Motion to Approve New Course Proposals**

ECO 270 – Applied Business Statistics (clarification received)

3. **Motion to Approve Expedited Proposals for Minor Changes**

   BS/BA History  
   BS NUR; 4 yr. program, ACE, RN-BSN  
   BA WLL (ITA 101, 200, 210)  
   BA WLL (GER 101, 201, 202, 203)  
   BA WLL (Spanish)

   **Motion approved unanimously**

   Minutes of February 4, 2016 were received

B. **LEPAC – LEP Approval Committee**

   **Motion to approve LEP Course**

   HIS 235 The Holocaust – Tier 2 (Existing Course – No revision)

   **Motion approved unanimously**

   Discussion: approval of new Tier 3 form

   Minutes of February 4, 2016 were received

C. **UWIC – University Wide Impact Committee**

   **Motion to approve MDC course approval pathway**

   MDC courses will follow the existing approval pathway for new course proposals (including DCC of proposer). The relevant UCF standing committee will determine if all necessary notifications have been done. The standing committee may also request approval from another department if it is deemed necessary (in consultation with the original proposer).

   **Discussion:** None

   **Motion approved unanimously**

   Minutes of February 4, 2016 were received

D. **PRAC – Program Review and Assessment Committee**

   **Motion to approve:**

   Honor’s College continual approval
Discussion: None

**Motion approved unanimously**

Minutes of February 4, 2016 were received

E. **WACC – Writing Across the Curriculum Committee**

No meeting this month

F. **LEPC – Liberal Education Program Committee**

Discussion: See new business

Minutes from February 4, 2016 received

V. **TAP Faculty Implementation Review Committee**

The most current versions of the Pathways can be found at: [http://www.ct.edu/initiatives/tap#pathways](http://www.ct.edu/initiatives/tap#pathways). Advantage to the current website versus posting on SCSU website is the timeliness of any updates.

TAP report: No new updates from TAP.

Discussion and Motion from Steering Committee on an articulation agreement with Housatonic Valley Community College. The motion is being presented for approval from UCF.

**Motion from Steering Committee:**

Students who graduate with an Associate’s Degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences: Humanities/Behavioral & Social Sciences Concentration from Housatonic Community College will be exempt from SCSU Tier 1 and Tier 2 requirements of the Liberal Education Program at Southern with the exception of Multilingual Communication. The two science courses must be TAP-vetted and at least one must have a laboratory requirement. One Quantitative Reasoning course must be at the TAP level (above the level of intermediate algebra). MAT E075 or E095 may not be used to fulfill the Quantitative Reasoning requirement.

Explanation from Deb Weiss:

The motion is similar to the articulation agreement with Gateway Community College that was approved by UCF in spring of 2015. At Housatonic there are 6 Liberal Arts and Science Programs and the one most well matched with LEP requirements at Southern is the Associate’s Degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences: Humanities/Behavioral & Social Sciences Concentration. It currently has approximately 200 students in that program. Deb Weiss reviewed requirements by Housatonic for
this concentration and explained the alignment to SCSU LEP program (see chart provided in UCF packet for 2/11/16).

Discussion:
Concern from membership was about the absence of critical thinking courses in the Housatonic program of study. Overall sense that clarity on the issue is needed before a vote is taken to approve the motion. Request that Deb Weiss ask Housatonic to specifically identify where critical thinking is embedded rather than just accepting at face value.

Response:
It is known that community college’s integration of critical thinking varies widely. However, community colleges are accountable for the critical thinking requirement and it is reasonable to expect that students who have successfully completed their Associates Degree would have had critical thinking infused in their courses. Additionally, it is common practice at SCSU for the LEP director to waive critical thinking requirements for students transferring in with 30 credits or more.

Motion to table motion and send back to Steering Committee
Proposed by Cindy Simoneau and second from Heidi Lockwood

Motion to table approved unanimously

VI. Special Topics Courses
   a. THR 398 Musical Rep Book Master Class May-Mester 2016
   b. SPA 498 At the Movies: Latin American Culture through Film Fall 2016
   c. EGR 398 Engineering Mechanics II (Dynamics) Fall 2016
   d. CMD 198 Fundamentals of Social Communication Summer 2016

UCF Chair has logged these courses

VII. Old Business
   None

VIII. New Business
   a. LEPC credit reduction option deliberation process in UCF
      Note: see the SCSU UCF organization shell in BBLearn9 for the report and additional written comments from faculty or constituency groups.
      To access the SCSU UCF Organization, login to Learn 9 and click on the MyOrganizations@SCSU tab seen on the upper right hand side of your screen.

   b. UCF Procedures for Deliberating LEPC’s Course Reduction Options
UCF Meeting Procedures

a. Limit reduction options to only those brought forward from LEPC
b. Any guest or constituency who would like to share comments, feedback, or opinions regarding any aspect of the LEPC report may do so via their UCF representative and/or in writing. Documents are to be submitted to either the UCF Chair or LEPC Chair, who are serving as moderators of the BBLearn9 UCF organization shell.

c. Any UCF member is also welcome to submit written comments in addition to speaking at a meeting. These written comments will also be posted to BBLearn9.
d. Turn taking by school, alternating between A&S and professional schools.
e. Speakers are limited to no more than 1 minute; Corey Hannah will serve as timekeeper.
f. Speakers who wish to speak again will be asked to wait until all others have had a chance to speak.
g. Voting will take place in 3 steps:
   1. Vote on a 3 or 6 credit reduction (or no reduction)
   2. Written ballot: if a 3-credit option is approved, members vote for one 3-credit option; if a 6-credit reduction is approved, members vote for two 3-credit options
   3. Vote on the specified conditions to be included in the package.

2/11: Initial reactions and understanding; beginning Impact discussion.
2/25: Advantageous and disadvantageous impacts to students and faculty for the 6 3-credit reduction options.
3/10: Continued Impact discussion; Advantages and disadvantages of a 3 or 6 credit reduction and conditions; VOTE on 3 or 6 credit reduction.
3/31: (if needed) finish discussion; Vote on specific reduction options.

Discussion on procedures:

Concern regarding limit to 1 minute as some departments may be more affected than others so need more time. Clarification included ensuring that there is ample time for all to be heard and BB9 is an option for additional comments. Liz stated that the committee understands that all are viable options but not equally desirable. It is also necessary to think about the students’ perspective – which ones are going to help students be able to become educated citizens. LEPC made specific recommendations based on specific guidelines. It is now up to UCF as a body and UCF has the responsibility to make sure people are able to ask questions to be informed about the options in order to discuss this with their departments/programs and find out how their department/program wants to vote.

Questions related to 3 and 6 credit LEPC reduction options:

Polly Beals introduced the committee and the process used to deliberate options. The committee used information from faculty insight, suggestions and recommendations made to the committee in the fall by a range of people at the university. Polly shared that members did not necessarily endorse each option; however wanted to put out as many options as possible. Polly also extended apology to any affected directors or program chairs that they did not speak directly to when developing these options.
Reduction options are: eliminate, embed or choose (see Appendix for LEPC documents)

Questions from UCF members:

- **Clarification requested on Charter Oak waiver for MC**

Response from Resha Cardone:

Charter Oak offers two avenues for students to earn college credit based on demonstrated college-level learning completed throughout their lives outside the classroom. Students wishing to earn life experience credit from Charter Oak can either take standardized exams to prove their knowledge in a given subject area, or create a portfolio demonstrating college-level learning not easily assessed through a standardized test. (Program details are easy to look up on Charter Oak’s webpage: [https://www.charteroak.edu/advising/lifeexperiencevideo.cfm](https://www.charteroak.edu/advising/lifeexperiencevideo.cfm))

The Department of World Languages and Literatures was asked to consider ways students coming to the University for the first time or returning to the University after many years might be granted a waiver for the MC requirement. The rationale was that this population of students is far from their high school language courses (if they had taken any courses at all), and hence would have to begin with 100-level classes.

In considering the options for granting waivers for the MC requirement to this group of older students, the WLL Department wanted to have a procedure in place similar to our other waiver options, which require either a proficiency examination or the verification of a transcript from a foreign high school. Additionally, we experienced some difficulty articulating the number of years one would need to be out of school and/or the age students would need to be to qualify for a waiver. We decided that if a student was able to earn credit for any subject through Charter Oak’s life experience credit program, then that student must necessarily be far enough away from their high school experience to qualify for a waiver without credit for the MC requirement.

- **Question on Options e. and f. (student or department choice of eliminating a Tier 2 requirement)**

Concerns included who chooses; would there be pressure on students from faculty as to which course to eliminate;

Response from committee: separate options to be voted on in either the 3 or 6 credit reduction option and again the committee heard the concerns but felt needed to put all viable options on the table. Also in reviewing what other universities offer, this is an option.

- **Question on why 3 or 6 credits when some courses would be a 4 credit course.**

Response from committee: could be either 3 or 4 credit course so ultimately (4 to 8 credit reduction option). Willingness to consider changing the language to 1 or 2 course reduction.

- **Question on any consideration under 6 credit reduction to combine one course from Tier 2 and one from Tier 3.**


Response from committee: not currently an option but to submit comment to BB9 platform on LEPC reductions.

-Question on if there would be enough Tier 2 courses available in all areas of knowledge should a choose option be approved

Response from committee: if that is the option chosen, would need to make courses available – don’t not go by what exists now; would need to change.

- Further clarification from committee:

If Tier 3 is omitted, departments can still have a capstone experience for their major; this vote would only take it out of LEPC and not the program requirement.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:49 am.

Respectfully Submitted:

Cheryl Resha
Liberal Education Program Credit Reduction Options (3-6 credits)

Rationale: UCF Motion Approved 11-19-16

UCF charges LEPC to develop options for reducing the LEP by at least 3 credits. Broad faculty input should be sought. LEPC is encouraged to consider achieving reductions in a variety of ways: e.g., merge two requirements, eliminate a requirement, embed a requirement in another requirement, etc. Any change involving the number of credits will be sent to faculty referendum for ratification.

Guiding Principles

State regulations stipulate that general education must be a minimum of 40 credits in a 4-year degree. The Transfer Articulation Policy (TAP) requires acceptance of 30 credits of general education between ConnSCU campuses; any changes to LEP must embrace SCSU’s ability to honor our commitments to demonstrate that TAP Competencies and Learning Outcomes are met in LEP. The LEP must uphold its foundational principles for cultivating educated citizens. Revisions should aim for simplicity.

Types of Options

1. Eliminate: eliminate one or more categories
2. Embed:
   a. embed key elements (or some key elements) from one category into another category
   b. select courses (W-course model or otherwise)
3. Choose/Select:
   a. Students (free choice) choose category(s) to exempt
   b. Departments (deliberate choice) choose category(s) to waive (waiver is based on proof that the key elements are substantially covered in existing major courses)

3-credit Reduction Options

A. Eliminate Tier 3 Capstone Seminar (Deliberately embed LEP Discussions of Values in T2 courses)

B. Eliminate MC for two subgroups of students

   (1) Students who transfer with 30 or more credits will receive a waiver for the Multilingual Communication requirement AND (2) Other students (native and transfer) who are eligible may obtain life experience credits from Charter Oak to receive a waiver for the Multilingual Communication requirement.

C. Embed Tier 1 Technological Fluency
   a. Using W-course model, embed “TF” into any course or
   b. Embed TF in courses in the majors

D. Embed Tier 1 Critical Thinking
   a. Using W-course model, embed “CT” into any course or
   b. Embed CT in courses in the majors

E. Students Choose 6 of 7 Tier 2 Areas of Knowledge: American Experience, Creative Drive, Cultural Expression, Global Awareness, Mind and Body, Social Structure, Conflict and Consensus, Time and Place

F. Departments Choose a Tier 2 Area of Knowledge to waive: (waiver is based on proof that the key elements are substantially covered in existing major courses)
6-credit Reduction Options

Create a 6-credit reduction option by putting any 2 3-credit options together

Current TAP Foundation courses (30 credits):

Tier 1: (15 credits) INQ, Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, Tech Fluency, Written Communication.

Tier 2: (15 credits) Cultural Expressions, Natural World I&II (6 credits), Social Structure, Conflict and Consensus, Time and Place.

Current non-TAP courses: transfer students fulfill these at SCSU or as electives prior to transfer or as part of the AA degree or Pathway

Tier 1: (3 credits) Multilingual Communication at 200 level

Tier 2: (12 credits) American Experience, Creative Drive, Global Awareness, Mind and Body

NOTE: State law on TAP does not dictate a unitary core curriculum. Rather, it is a guide for transfer course equivalencies, aiming for “seamless transfer”. We’re committed to credits and learning outcomes; we have some flexibility with what courses we put the competencies and learning outcomes in.
Pros and Cons for LEP-Reduction Options

3-CREDIT REDUCTION OPTIONS

A. Eliminate Tier 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most changed from original LEP meaning. No longer a true LEP capstone course. Too many restrictions from majors make the meaning of T3 unclear to students</td>
<td>Harms departments that do not require a specific T3 in major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to change if capstones returned to majors</td>
<td>What happens to T3 courses that already exist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone should be tied to the major; create an explicit linkage between LEP and major</td>
<td>Eliminating T3 impacts 50% of all current T3 courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstones should be in major; too important to be a “random” pick</td>
<td>Does damage to concept of “synthesis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effect on students switching majors, a huge population at Southern (may be the only option with no effect)</td>
<td>Where, then, would values be focused on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most “clean” for student and easiest to advise.</td>
<td>Without T3 pinnacle, it’s more like old AUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values are already embedded in T1 and T2 and can be more so</td>
<td>Doesn’t reduce overall credits toward graduation for many majors (if capstone is moved from LEP to major)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A number of positive comments from T3 instructors during affinity group meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
B. **Eliminate MC for two subgroups of students:**

(1) Students who transfer with 30 or more credits will receive a waiver for the Multilingual Communication requirement **AND**
(2) Other students (native and transfer) who are eligible may obtain life experience credits from Charter Oak to receive a waiver for the Multilingual Communication requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eases transferability to SCSU</td>
<td>May incentivize transferring to SCSU from another institution and/or delaying when a student chooses to transfer to SCSU, affecting recruitment of native students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More closely aligns SCSU’s language requirement with that of our sister institutions for certain groups of students</td>
<td>Does not constitute a 3-credit reduction for all SCSU students—only transfer students and students eligible to earn life experience credit would experience a credit reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would streamline advising transfer students on community college campuses</td>
<td>Transfer and native students would not have the same LEP requirements; consequently, the proposal would create two classes of students (transfer/non-traditional age students and traditional age native students) with different LEP requirements. This could set a precedent leading to more requests for exceptions for transfer students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might make SCSU more appealing than sister institutions for non-traditional age students because there would be fewer requirements for them</td>
<td>Suggests that non-traditional age students are incapable of learning a second language, a notion unsubstantiated by the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would provide a way for students returning to the university many years after taking a high school language with a mechanism to opt out of the MC requirement. (The proposed mechanism to waive the requirement by earning life credit through Charter Oak would be similar to the other waiver options the WLL Department offers: waiver through examination or through transcript verification.)</td>
<td>Transfer and non-traditional age students would not gain the cognitive, financial and personal benefits of learning a second language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain groups of students would not gain an intermediate-low proficiency in a foreign language, one of the distinguishing features of SCSU’s liberal arts education.

Would affect a single Department

Contradicts Southern’s mission “to empower […] students with knowledge, skills and perspectives essential for active participation and impassioned, ethical leadership in our rapidly changing global society.”
## C. Embed Tier 1 Technological Fluency (TF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W-course mode would maintain rigor but eliminate credits</td>
<td>Assessment data shows success in TF course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves other problems with T1 (problems of tiers not working right)</td>
<td>Might require extra admin (in same sense as WACC with director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives new students more choice in content. May give first-year students a course more relevant to major or interest area in first semester</td>
<td>Embedding can be challenging. Other embedding of competencies already not working (ex. Information Literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If planned properly, content could be more relevant to students; more specific to their majors.</td>
<td>TF part of SCSU Strategic Plan and national initiatives promoting STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not single out disciplines or departments, but makes TF relevant to disciplines (and, so, students)</td>
<td>If moved to major (or if majors are allowed to restrict), may have an effect on students switching majors (as restrictions in TF currently do)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If embedded in T2 (and no restrictions allowed), would not affect students switching majors</td>
<td>Will mean departments with current TF courses will need to move those courses to T2 categories, which may require some reworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments with current TF courses can move these courses into T2 categories</td>
<td>Does not affect T2 (heart of the LEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not affect T2 (heart of the LEP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Embed Tier 1 Critical Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT might make more sense to student</td>
<td>Might require extra admin (in same sense as WACC with director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W-course mode would maintain rigor but eliminate credits</td>
<td>Embedding can be challenging. Other embedding of competencies already not working (ex. Information Literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves other problems with T1 (problems of tiers not working right)</td>
<td>If moved to major (or if majors are allowed to restrict), may have an effect on students switching majors (as restrictions in TF currently do)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives new students more choice in content.</td>
<td>Will mean departments with current CT courses will need to move those courses to T2 categories, which may require some reworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May give first-year students a course more relevant to major or interest area in first semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT courses already have context, so makes sense to move them to appropriate T2 Areas of Knowledge (reflects current reality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If planned properly, content could be more relevant to students; more specific to their majors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not single out disciplines or departments, but makes CT relevant to disciplines (and, so, students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If embedded in T2 (and no restrictions allowed), would not affect students switching majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments with current CT courses can move these courses into T2 categories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not affect T2 (heart of the LEP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
E. **Students Choose 6 of 7 Tier 2 Areas of Knowledge:** American Experience, Creative Drive, Cultural Expression, Global Awareness, Mind and Body, Social Structure: Conflict and Consensus, Time and Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives more sense of control to student of his/her education. More choice and options for students</td>
<td>Students might opt out of a major area that they are weak in and thus erode LEP principle of creating educated citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effect on students switching majors if students are choosing which category not to take rather than departments choosing.</td>
<td>May tempt admin to offer fewer sections of the “expensive” T2 courses and more super-sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual departments will feel less strained. Does not affect one single department</td>
<td>Can be confusing because of TAP and major restrictions in many T2 Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More evenly spreads impact of reducing credits/courses/sections</td>
<td>If departments want their majors to have a certain course and restrict them then the idea that the student chooses 6 of 7 is not really true due to restrictions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
F. Departments Choose a Tier 2 Area of Knowledge to waive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If departments are able to choose, gives some control of LEP to departments</td>
<td>If departments can choose, more effect on students switching majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If departments choose, gives heavy credit majors opportunity to identify overlapping knowledge areas and reduce credits</td>
<td>May tempt admin to offer fewer sections of the “expensive” T2 courses if area is waived by a number of departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual departments will feel less strained. Does not affect one single department</td>
<td>Can be confusing because of TAP and major restrictions in many T2 Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More evenly spreads impact of reducing credits/courses/sections</td>
<td>If departments choose, it just adds another “restriction,” creating confusion. Difficult to advise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: