

Undergraduate Curriculum Forum

AGENDA

Adanti Student Center, Room 301A
Thursday, Sept. 30, 2010

- I. Call to order
- II. Announcements
- IV. Approval of UCF minutes of Sept. 16, 2010
- V. Standing committees Reports
 - a. NPIC
 - b. NMC
 - c. PRAC
 - d. UWIC
 - e. WACC
- VI. Chair's Report
 - a. Status of special elections.
 - b. Fall agenda items for UCF.
- VII. LEPC Report

Undergraduate Curriculum Forum

Minutes

Adanti Student Center, Room 301A

Thursday September 16, 2010

Present: M. Hartog, M. Narumanchi, K. McGill, R. Vaters-Carr, M. Das, S. Grace, G. Kowalczyk, S. Felsenfeld, S. Kopaczewski, L. Lancor, L. Bower, J. Fullmer, M. Fede, C. Hannah, B. Nakamura, T. Radice, C. Simoneau, J. Hong, J. Fields, J. Irving, J. Strawn, K. Lacey, M. Vancour, S. Bernard, H. Lockwood, K. Cummings, S. Creamer, P. Kahlbaugh, D. Smith, G. Adams, E. Keenan, S. Latorre, J. Mielczarski, K. Barnett, G. Cochenet, A. Marsoobian, M. Shea, P. Beals, L. Lancor, S. Clerc, K. Laing, N. Moniello, D. Bentley-Drobish, S. Heller

Absent: M. Generali, A. Abugri, S. Grubacic, M. McClain, E. West, G. Bogel, C. Dellinger-Pate, G. Brady, R. Kustin, J. Tait, M. Kiarie, W. Elwood, J. McGinn, S. Graves, B. Glynn

- I. The meeting was called to order at 9:40am.
- II. Announcements
 - a. CSU-AAUP Chapter Meeting on Monday, September 20, 2010 – 11:30am-1pm in ASC Theater with Vijay Nair
 - b. Regarding links in recent email from AAUP not working, M. Shea requested that AAUP office be contacted about these and any future occurrences as they are encountered.
 - c. M. Fede commented regarding (1) deadlines for Fall 2011 course proposals and deadlines. C. Simoneau responded that dates are on the website and that proposals will be reviewed as received beyond those dates; and (2) that the protected word documents for new online UCF course proposals are difficult to manage due to instructions printing repeatedly. It was suggested that the documents be modified into two separate documents—instructions and proposal forms.
 - d. M. Hartog announced that scanned documents should be saved so that they are small enough to be sent via email.
 - e. Majors Expo scheduled for Wednesday, October 27th from 12-3pm in the ASC
- III. Approval of UCF minutes of May 20, 2010
 - a. Attendance edits – pending approval
- IV. Approval of UCF minutes of September 2, 2010
 - a. Approval with the following corrections:
 - i. Under announcements – correction 9/7/10 not 1/7/10
 - ii. Under III – change TL to TF
 - b. Quorum met (32 voting members present) and approved the minutes (MO: C. Simoneau; 2nd: M. Shea; one abstention)

V. Standing Committee Reports

a. NPIC

i. Discussion of 9/9 meeting minutes

Special topics courses approved.

1. COM 498 Communication Processes in Event Planning (Comment from REC – they have a course that delivers similar content and don't object to the Special Topic course but will want notification if a course is proposed --- they have REC 363 Event Management and Promotion – Recommendation to contact COM Dept., note this will be the 2nd offering of COM 498)
2. ENG 298 Lyrics as Literature: Folk Singer-Songwriter Traditions
3. ENG 398 Exploring Young Adult Literature
4. HIS 298 Ancient Military History
5. MDS 298 Contemporary Media Debates
6. NUR 498 Advanced Special Topics in Health Care: Palliative and End-of-Life Care Colloquium
7. PHI398 Ethical Individualism
8. SWK 398 Children and Families in child Welfare: A Practice Perspective
9. SWK 398 Community Mental Health and Substance Abuse
10. SWK 398 Gerontological Social Work Practice with Elders and Families

ii. Discussed policy for new minor proposals

iii. Minutes of 9/9 received

b. NMC

i. SCC chair of Arts & Sciences attended NMC on 9/9 to discuss process of proposals

ii. Discussed LEP process of proposals with M. Hartog to streamline flow

iii. Discussed status of proposals being posted online

iv. Still accepting paper proposals but want to move toward all online submissions {only new and revised course proposal forms and directions are available online now }

v. Minutes of 9/9 received

c. PRAC

i. Discussion of 9/9 meeting focusing on PRAC's review of Political Science's standards 1-3, which were all met

ii. Motion to approve PRAC report giving approval to Program Review of Political Science Department– MO passed – one abstention

iii. Minutes of 9/9 received

d. UWIC

i. MO: BA in Economics have a representative and alternate on UCF {they moved from Business School to Arts & Sciences/housed with Political Science}– MO passed – one abstention

1. Note: last year UWIC determined guidelines for programs joining UCF

ii. Discussed how LEPC and UWIC will work to maintain the spirit of the document in the process for review of proposals

iii. Minutes of 9/9 received

- e. WACC
 - i. Discussion implications of W-courses in accordance with LEP – process will be determined
 - ii. WACC contest will be announced this fall (earlier than usual)
 - iii. Three new workshops held during fall on Wed. (food provided/title in WACC minutes)
 - iv. MO to accept three new W-courses: PHI 490, SOC 490, ENG 217; MO passed – one abstention
 - v. Minutes of 9/9 received

- f. LEPC
 - i. Discussed minutes from 9/1 and 9/8
 - ii. Announced that LEPC needs representatives from School of Health and Human Services and School of Business; LEPC meets every week from 3:30-5pm on Wed.
 - iii. MO: LEPC will begin operating with the three former members of GETF members (Mike Shea, Winnie Yu, Jim Tait) from last year as voting members of LEPC until such time that vacancies are filled by election for the School of Business and School of Health and Human Resources and a replacement is found for E. Okobi. LEPC will determine which vacancy will be filled by which former GETF member. MO passed – one abstention

Discussion of CT and TF transitions -

- iv. UCF discussed the LEPC's MO: New and revised LEP courses shall be approved for 5 years and are subject to revalidation through a process to be devised by the LEPC and approved by UCF (sunset provision) (tabled)
- v. MO: CT (Critical Thinking) and TF (Technological Fluency) courses must either be new courses or revised courses that meet the purposes and key elements stated in the LEP document and the learning outcomes defined by the CT and TF working groups (tabled)
- vi. MO: Proposal for Course Prefixes and Banner Codes (tabled)
- vii. Minutes of 9/1 and 9/8 received

Meeting adjourned at 10:50am.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Michele Vancour.

Called to order at 9:40am

Present: G. Adams (Chair), M. Bay, G. Cochenet, G. Kowalczyk, K. McGill

I. New Business

A. Notification of 2 special topic sections were presented and logged.

<u>Course #</u>	<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Semester</u>	<u>Times taught</u>
MDS 298	Social Media: Public/Private	Spring 2011	0
PHY 398	Astrophysics	Spring 2011	0

Description of logged courses

MDS 298 – Social Media: Public Life/Private Life

A critical examination of social media’s digital transformation of public and private life. Students will examine public/private life in terms of history, social functions, fluidity and redefinition in today’s social networking environment.

PHY 398 - Astrophysics

This course is intended to give the science-minded undergraduate a first course in the physics of celestial objects, phenomena, and processes. At the end of the course, it is expected that the student will understand and be able to apply physical reasoning to make basic deductions regarding these phenomena.

II. Old Business

A. NPIC began crafting a formal set of instructions for new minor program proposals as well as a format for submission.

Meeting adjourned at 10:50am.

Respectfully submitted by: Gregory Adams

**Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
Notification Management Committee Minutes
September 23, 2010**

In attendance: Cindy Simoneau (Co-chair), Karen Barnett (Co-chair), Laura Bower, Scott Creamer, Margaret Das, Sean Grace, Corey Hannah, Shana Kopaczewski, Sobeira Latorre, Nuncia Moniello, Sophia Myers (UCF Secretary)

Absent: Kim Laing, Erin Larkin

Meeting called to order at 9:35am

New Course Proposals

ESC 492 – Undergraduate Thesis proposal

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

ESC 493 – Undergraduate Thesis

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

Revised Course Proposals

ESC 210 – Principles of Astronomy

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

ESC 350 – Structural Geology

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

ESC 420 – Economic Geology

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

EDU 453 – Student Teaching Seminar

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; S. Creamer

Motion passed: 10-0-0

EDU 455 – Secondary School Student Teaching

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; C. Hannah

Motion passed: 10-0-0

GER 201 – Continuing German: Contemporary German Culture

GER 202 – Continuing German: Exploring a German City

GER 203 – Continuing German: Exploring German Culture

SPA 101 – Spanish II

SPA 200 – Spanish III

SPA 210 – Spanish IV

* changed minimum grade from C- to C

* UWIC acted on proposals and sent to UCF (approved)

Motion to approve:

Motion: Sean Grace, Shana Kopaczewski,

Motion Passed: 10-0-0

Revised Program Proposals

B.A., Earth Science

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

B.S., Earth Science/Concentration: Secondary Education Certification

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

B.S., Earth Science/Concentration: Environmental Earth Science

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

B.S., Earth Science/Concentration: Geology

Minor in Earth Science

Motion to approve:

Motion: S. Grace; M. Das

Motion passed: 10-0-0

Tabled Revised Course Proposal (Require Clarification)

Revised Course Proposals

ENG 325 – English Medieval Literature (**Tabled Pending clarification on prerequisite course numbers**)

EXS 383 – Kinesiology (**Tabled pending notification from Biology Department**)

WLL 452 – Secondary School Student Teaching (**Tabled pending clarification on semester length for student teaching**)

Meeting adjourned at 10:50am

PRAC minutes for September 23, 2010

Attendance: Susan Clerc, Karen Cummings, Sanja Grubacic, Tom Radice, Charlie Dellinger-Pate, Susan Felsenfeld, Marybeth Fede, Patricia Kahlbaugh, Jane McGinn, Scott Graves

None absent

Meeting began at 9:35 a.m. in ASC 229

The committee met to discuss the revised self-study report submitted by the Marketing program. The self-study report, containing standards 1-17, was prepared by Assessment Coordinators, Dr. Richard Kustin and Dr. Melvin Prince. This report was originally reviewed by PRAC at the end of Spring 2010, but due to time constraints PRAC had not examined revisions offered by Marketing before the semester ended. Committee members discussed the self-study and then met with Dr. Kustin and Dr. Lodha at 10:30. It was agreed that the Marketing self-study has **conditional approval**. Conditional approval means that Marketing will have 11 months to revise their program review. PRAC members provided feedback to Dr. Lodha and Dr. Kustin as they move forward in the assessment process. Some specific recommendations can be found in the PRAC report on Marketing.

The Accounting program is our next business. PRAC should receive their report by September 29, 2010 and will meet with them on October 7th.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:50.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Patricia Kahlbaugh

Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC)

University Curriculum Forum

Undergraduate Program Review Report: Marketing – School of Business
September 28, 2010

The Marketing Department in the School of Business submitted a self-study report to UCF – PRAC at the end of March 2010. The self-study covered standards 1-17 of the Academic Program Review document. PRAC met to discuss this report in April. Representatives from Marketing were unable to attend the meeting due to meetings involving the hiring of a new Dean for the School of Business. To accommodate that scheduling issue, Patricia Kahlbaugh met with representatives, Dr. Lodha and Dr. Kustin at another time in order to convey the thoughts of the PRAC committee. At that time, recommendations were made for revision. Because both English and Music had been scheduled for mid-April, PRAC suggested that Marketing make their revisions by the end of the spring 2010 semester and PRAC would place Marketing as Old Business at the beginning of the Fall 2010 semester.

Marketing's revised report was delivered to PRAC members on September 9, 2010. PRAC reviewed all submitted materials and met with Dr. Richard Kustin, the Marketing Department's assessment coordinator, and Dr. Shyam Lodha, the Department's chairperson, for discussion on September 23, 2010. Revisions of the self-study were noted and discussed. The nature of these revisions warranted a decision of conditional approval. PRAC made it known to Dr Kustin and Dr. Lodha that PRAC would make the recommendation of **conditional approval** to UCF, which would mean Marketing now has 11 additional months to make revisions.

PRAC commends the work done so far by the Marketing Department and has made the following suggestions for revision of Standards 1-17:

Standard 1: The department/program's mission supports the university's mission

Recommendation and Feedback: To link the mission of department more concretely to the mission of the university. The mission of the Marketing department is: commitment to academic excellence, provides professional training, prepares students for leadership roles. Need to articulate how these support the university's mission.

Standard 2: Program goals and objectives

Does provide list of what program intends students to learn based on participation in the program.

Recommendation and Feedback: Need to add statement(s) about what the program intends to do as goals. Section begins with what students will be able to do after the program- which is fine, but this should follow from what the program intends to do. Marketing identified the following six program goals in term of what students will be able to do: Basic tools (methods, theories) of organizational strategy; Top Management perspectives; Communicate findings; Team Skills; Critical thinking concepts; Tools to serve students' professional opportunities (is this last one different from other goals already listed?).

Standard 3: Program level expected student outcomes

There are four program level expected student outcomes: Marketing skill comprehension (recognizing marketing problems; understanding basic marketing principles); Analytic skills (knowing analytic tools, using marketing databases); Decision Making Skills and lastly, Critical Thinking

There are Direct Measures using data from capstone – MKT 450
Covers basic methods, concepts and theories (see program goal #1)
Covers top management perspectives (see program goal #2)
Covers communication (see program goal #3)
Covers a component on team skills (see program goal #4) and critical thinking (see program goal #5)

Recommendation and Feedback: Good start. Think more about how these are nested within the program level goals. Use the program goals to drive the expected student outcomes and then link these with specific course content. When linked with specific course content across the curriculum, the department can identify areas where achievement is measurable.

On standard 3, I would recommend additional strategies for measuring student outcomes - not only the performance in capstone course- but also the link between the performance and expectations of students in MKT 200 (a primary prerequisite) and MKT 450 (the capstone).

Standard 4: Uses student data to improve program

Recommendation and Feedback: The report in general needs more narrative and more explanation of everything, more recent and analyzed data.

Marketing should provide more detail on how the department does or plans to use data from standard 3 to change curriculum or course content. Right now, the report doesn't indicate any reflection about how they might apply data to the program for self-improvement. How often do Marketing faculty meet to discuss cases, every semester or once a year? It has been done since 2008, so are there any ideas from these discussions about how to improve program? According to the report, faculty were able to see the strengths and weaknesses in the student. Can this approach also inform faculty about the strengths and weakness in the program? Has this been done? And if so, what has been the outcome of such an analysis?

Paragraph 3 ("The department recruits...") should be moved to standard 7.

Standard 5: Quality of instruction and teaching effectiveness

Recommendation and Feedback: Requires at least 2 more syllabi. Some description of how the assignments reflect or assess the learning outcomes is needed, either in chart form or narrative. See standard 4: there's no description of how data has changed teaching. If they haven't gathered the data, they should describe their plan to do so.

Only have 3 syllabi in appendix B. Need to relate program goals and expected student outcomes to the course objectives/course syllabi.

For 5b. where is this data coming from that is being evaluated?

No summary data from standard 3.. question is do they have a good enough plan in place to generate this type of data?

Missing: Summary of how assignment relate to outcomes

Missing: 5 or more syllabi

Standard 6: Curricular development

Recommendation and Feedback: The first paragraph needs editing. The graduation rates table should be revised and moved to standard 7. Table 1 should link the courses more clearly to the learning outcomes and goals of standards 2 & 3. A more developed matrix would be helpful.

Good example – Marketing management, Retail management and Sales management.

But, how do the other courses fit in with program goals, specific learning outcomes and now these three “specializations of marketing, retail and sales management”? How does the curriculum align with standards in the field? Is there a sequence to the courses that shows how one course builds on another in order to provide the students with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required? (This could be shown with a matrix or diagram and explanation of how it works.)

Needs more information here, more specific detail about how courses are linked to form coherent curriculum. Information about courses and links between them would be welcome detail. Reference is made to how curriculum is commensurate with other universities, but again documentation/detail of how that is the case would be welcome. A curriculum map (such as shown in Standard 3) would be helpful.

Further articulation of the relationship between undergraduate and graduate programs would be welcome

Standard 7: Faculty, students, staff

Recommendation and Feedback: Confused by Table 4 regarding enrollment data – is this for marketing or for business? Looking at Table 2 it seems as though the program only has 14 students and has only graduated 2 of them in 6 years (14.3%) – can this be correct? The fact book states they graduated 37 students last year and have approximately 200 majors enrolled in classes last year. The table that is included is confusing and not as complimentary to their program as the fact book tables..

The most significant (and perhaps the most constructive) thing I can say is that for standard 7, they need to provide a stronger rationale for the optimal number of faculty. They say that they have three, and used to have six. But though they indicate that they would love to have more faculty lines, they never explain what specializations need to be covered, so that their program can be considered “adequate” compared to similar programs at other institutions. This is a place where they can really explain what holes in the marketing curriculum need to be filled.

They provide everything for 7a, but the list of faculty and student awards should go in standard 7.

Missing: Any information about students (recruitment – where do students come from? Demographics? Awards?)

Missing: Any information about support staff

Missing: Idea of what would be the optimal number of faculty and students?

Standard 8: Student Advisement

Recommendation and Feedback: Marketing’s report of their assessment describes how students are advised and ratio of students to faculty. The report does not include information regarding how they have assessed the program sequence, rotation plan, tracking students through the program or forms used during advisement. A table is provided with little explanation as to what it means or what they have learned are the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

Mention is made to the enrollment increase and low number of full-time faculty. More specific description as to what each faculty member teaches would strengthen this argument.

Mention is made to a handbook but no information as to what is included in the handbook and what the department has learned through the assessment process that would assist students through the curriculum.

No explanation of how students with academic difficulties are counseled. Think about how to address the problems identified in advising when students enter into program late in undergraduate career.

No information regarding responsibilities of faculty members coordinating the program, library resources, scheduling, or budgeting is provided.

For standard 8, they provide the first three items on the checklist: how students are assigned advisors, the number of advisors, and the student-faculty ratio. It's 70:1, which seems overwhelming – yet another place to indicate why they need more faculty to deal with their majors. They also do provide a description of how they advise their students about what courses to take. And it seems like the form they use for advising is the degree evaluation form. They don't provide anything else for standard 8 and nothing is provided for 8a.

Standard 9: Sections of courses

Recommendation and Feedback: Details the hardship case of low number of faculty. It does not provide documentation that a three to five year course rotation plan is published and followed.

For 9, they provide a table about data provided by Dr. Riccardi and Dr. Kennedy, but need to provide explanatory narrative. Evidently it's supposed to demonstrate that there are enough courses provided. There's no course rotation plan. They refer to "Key Trends and Graduation Numbers figures below," but I don't see any such figures. Perhaps they're listed in a separate standard?

Graduation rates (30/year) doesn't match with earlier table – I recommend deleting the earlier table and/or clearing up situation.

10. Climate of intellectual and professional curiosity -

Recommendation and Feedback: Neglected to mention any involvement or plan for involvement of students. They mentioned one contest students entered back in 2007. Faculty were published, but one faculty member had nothing within the 5 year range. Need more narrative discussing strengths, weaknesses and plans here, which can be picked up again in standards 16 and 17.

What journal did the department publish – should make a bigger deal of this, right? What are Romanian NGOs – again I'd clarify to make a greater impact.

Any plans to enhance this? Any strengths? Weaknesses? Challenges?

11. Evidence of scholarship – Met

Recommendation and Feedback: Could use FAAR reports and could provide narrative about particular successes.

Standard 12: Library Resources

Recommendation and Feedback: The results from survey of narrative description of faculty views on library holdings (Standard 12) are not included in the report. The results from survey of student satisfaction with library holdings are stated as: "overwhelming: yes", but this was not supported by the actual evidence.

Standard 13: Faculty and Resources

Recommendation and Feedback: Could provide data here to support their need to reduce adjunct rates. This might be a good place to really highlight the high faculty/student ratios. Also, they note that they don't currently have any specialized computer or lab facilities for marketing projects. If this is something that they feel is compromising the quality of the program, they should say this and maybe

give some examples of the ways in which such facilities, if available, would be used.

Seabury Recommendation: Case could be made that is even stronger ... maybe something about how the facilities issues adversely affect the mission, goals, etc of the department?

Standard 14: Department Engages in Review and Self-Evaluation:

Recommendation and Feedback: There are some strengths that could be highlighted here, including the use of outside marketing scholars to review the curriculum and the planned development of a marketing review board. They have also recently developed an alumni survey, an employer survey and a senior majors (exit) survey. These tools look very promising. They indicate that the results of these surveys will be "discussed among faculty members and used to make adjustments were [sic] these are deemed necessary in order to improve the program." As with other standards, this comment could be expanded to describe more specific mechanisms they are developing to help them convert the large amount of survey data they will receive into "action plans." In terms of style, as we discussed at the meeting, they should move the comments into an Appendix, and maybe just provide a brief summary of the highlights in the body of the document, based on N surveys obtained in xx and yy years.

Missing: Narrative description of improvements made or planned based on the results of student survey

Missing: Frequency of follow up

Standard 15: The department's activity in community service and outreach is appropriate to the mission of the program and the university

Recommendation and Feedback: Good – could be more specific about how each activity supports/or is appropriate to the mission of program and university.

Standard 16: The department provides an analysis of program strength and weaknesses

Recommendation and Feedback: To try to find out how many majors Marketing has versus how many students at SCSU take classes in Marketing. Would be helpful in evaluating needs. Identified strength in curriculum revision. Nicely identified additional courses needed for program, which indicates need for more faculty. Both the revision of the curriculum and additional faculty to support curricular initiatives could have been explained further under standard 6 (as well as included here in standard 16).

Areas for improvement are identified; however should be tied back to the various standards reviewed if possible. For example, what in the report has pointed to a need for areas of specialization and additions to curriculum. Could make these connections more explicit for the reviewer. Are the addition of three courses in the course offerings particularly in areas of three specialization (e.g., marketing communications and promotion, marketing management, and relationship marketing) tied to program goals and expected student learning outcomes? Are these part of how you described your curriculum in standard 6? These are some questions that may be useful to ask.

Standard 17: The department describes a vision and action plan for the future

Recommendation and Feedback: Good identification of vision and action plan. Some general recommendations are to align the vision and action plan in a deliberate way with the mission and goals of the department and the strengths and weaknesses identified through the self-study. All of these goals for the future are admirable. Confident that as the report is revised, the vision and action plan for future will be better supported by the report narrative.

University-Wide Impact Committee

Minutes 9/23/10

Present

P. Beals, J. Fields, J. Fullmer, N. Henderson, J. Irving, E. Keenan, L. Lancor, H. Lockwood, A. Marsoobian, M. McClain, J. Mielczarski, B. Nakamura, J. O'Hara, A. Reynaga, M. Shea, J. Strawn, D. Weiss, W. Yu.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:50 am.

II. Old Business

The standing committee continued discussion and review of its guidelines for evaluating Tier 1 course proposals for both critical thinking and technological fluency classes. Specifically, the committee reviewed and discussed course development guides provided by A. Marsoobian (critical thinking) and W. Yu (technological fluency). Particular attention was paid towards what specific material in a course proposal would constitute adequate demonstration of the learning outcomes for each type of course and how the process of evaluating proposals could be streamlined.

III. New Business

There was no new business on the agenda.

IV. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 am.

Minutes prepared by Byron Nakamura

WAC Committee Meeting September 23, 2010

Attending: K. Lacey (Chair), S. Ellis (ex-officio), D. Petrowski, A. Eich-Kroh, T. Ferrucci (ex-officio), S. Corbett (ex-officio), K. Marsland

Electronic Proposal Recommendations: D. Smith, N. Marano, K. Burke

1. WACC Chairperson Report

- a. Issue: The same proposals submitted from one department but from different faculty when the course has to be taught strictly the same way to up-held curriculum standards. The committee agrees that it would like to see individual syllabi from faculty to see how instructors implemented W-course
- b. S. Corbett explains that there will be a meeting with Provost Dr. Williams to have a bigger space for a Student Learning Center as part of the strategic plan on October 8 at 3:00 PM

2. WACC Director Report

- a. S. Ellis distributed flyers for the first workshop to be held September 29th 1 p.m. in EN 253. Focus on incorporating short writing assignments that facilitate critical thinking in courses – facilitated by D. Carroll
- b. New student worker Michelle Stevens has been hired for the WAC Program
- c. Steven Corbett will facilitate the second workshop Tips for Handling the Paper Grading Load – October 27th 1 p.m. EN 253.

3. Writing Center Director Report

- a. T. Ferrucci sent information to all FYE faculty offering to give a tour of the Writing Center explaining how it can help the students. So far 140 students have taken advantage of it.
- b. Last year 48% of all students using the writing center were transfer students; of these 35% from community colleges and 13% from other 4-year institutions

4. Review of Proposals

Course: ENG 460 (Queer Theory), 461 (The Beat Movement), and 462 (Gay and Lesbian Film Literature)

Course: LIT/JST 300 (The Literature of the Hebrew Bible)

Course: JST 398 (Topics in Feminist Biblical Interpretation: Sex, Slavery, and Sexuality)

Faculty: C. Blackmer

Decision: All proposals approve with clarification (7-0-0)

Course: PHI 420 (American Philosophy)

Faculty: A. Marsoobian

Decision: Approve (7-0-0)

Course: SOC 360 (Social Change) and SOC 370 (Methods of Social Research)

Faculty: J. Bloch

Decision: Both proposals approve with clarification (5-1-1)

Course: CHEM 261 (Organic Chemistry II)

Faculty: A. Karatjas

Decision: Approved with clarification (5-0-0)

5. W-Course Approval Process (to be discussed next meeting)

- a. Discussion regarding move to approving faculty rather than course by course approval
- b. Discussion regarding ongoing assessment of approved proposals particularly if we move to approval of faculty

6. Impact of LEP on WAC Program

- a. Transitioning approved W-Courses to LEP courses
 - i. First issue: Gen Ed courses that have been approved as W-courses - how will they be reviewed when courses are transferred by the departments and not per faculty into the LEP program?
 - ii. Second issue: If Tier I courses become W-courses then students might be excluded who have not taken ENG 112 yet. Allowing ENG 112 to be a co- instead of a pre-requisite?
 - iii. S. Ellis will discuss both issues with Polly Beals Director of the LEP

Motion to UCF to approve the following (8) writing intensive sections:

Course: ENG 460 (Queer Theory) **Faculty:** C. Blackmer

Course: ENG 461 (The Beat Movement) **Faculty:** C. Blackmer

Course: 462 (Gay and Lesbian Film Literature) **Faculty:** C. Blackmer

Course: LIT/JST 300 (The Literature of the Hebrew Bible) **Faculty:** C. Blackmer

Course: JST 398 (Topics in Feminist Biblical Interpretation: Sex, Slavery, and Sexuality) **Faculty:** C. Blackmer

Course: PHI 420 (American Philosophy)

Faculty: A. Marsoobian

Course: SOC 360 (Social Change) and SOC 370 (Methods of Social Research)

Faculty: J. Bloch

Course: CHEM 261 (Organic Chemistry II)

Faculty: A. Karatjas

Course: CHE 260 (Organic Chemistry I)

Faculty: A. Coca

Respectfully Submitted: A. Eich-Kroh, WACC Secretary

Minutes of the Liberal Education Program Committee Meeting

Wednesday, September 15, 2010, 3:15pm Math Conference Room

Member Present: Bennett, DaPonte, Fields, Lancor, Levine and Marsoobian

Ex-officio Members Present: Clerc, Beals

Visitors: Shea, Tait and Yu

1. The committee approved the minutes of the September 8th meeting with some minor revisions.
2. The Chairperson introduced Susan Clerc as the new Library Liaison.
3. The LEPC Director agreed to distribute regular emails to all full time and part time faculty members keeping them advised about developments of our committee. A dedicated LEP website is under development for the purpose of disseminating these updates on a regular basis.
4. The chairperson distributed a preliminary AUR to LEP course transition table for discussion.
5. The chairperson distributed a draft worksheet designed to help departments complete a degree evaluation using the information provided in the AUR to LEP transition table. A completed worksheet was distributed using the Computer Science degree evaluation as a sample. The committee reviewed and discussed the form.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted by. John DaPonte.