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Chair Pratt called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

1. Meeting minutes presented for approval – B. Nowlan identified #8 - change to "for a minimum" instead of or a minimum. Minutes approved as amended.

2. Senate Chair S. Harrison - presented on the charge for APC and ULEC. ULEC is responsible for developing goals and outcomes and recommending intended learning outcomes to the Academic Policies Committee and to the University Senate (p. 33). In the same handbook (p. 32) - APC is charged with degree requirements. Any suggested changes to the learning outcomes presented/endorsed by APC can be discussed at the following senate meeting. Senate Chair S. Harrison suggests endorsing the proposed outcomes for review by the open Senate meeting the following week. This is true, even if the proposed outcomes are endorsed with amendments or modifications. We have today and next Tuesday to make amendments, revisions, concerns, or suggestions that go along with this proposal. It is a courtesy to send it to APC for review. It is our role to provide feedback regarding this proposal - not to approve but rather to endorse (or reject) and make suggestions. We should consider whether they are aligned with the liberal education reform principles and with UWEC's goals.

3. Departmental Chairs C. Manning and T. Hilton addressed questions about the liberal education proposal.
   a. Chairs want us to know about the time spent to develop these outcomes. Time was spent to consider how current and future courses would align with these learning outcomes. The chairs broke into disciplinary groups - met for 2, 1 1/2 hours sessions to determine how the outcomes apply to their disciplines. Each subgroup sent a document to the entire chairs group to address goals/outcomes from each discipline. A great deal of time was spent addressing wording for each goal. Learning process was appreciated by chairs. It was positive to see how chairs from different disciplines viewed the goals from a liberal education perspective instead of a discipline specific perspective. The chairs have a consensus about the goals and wording, acknowledging that they don't necessarily agree on every little element. As a whole, the chairs agree on the goals.

   b. T. Hilton discussed the product. There was no intent of redoing the goals and outcomes from a content perspective. They focused on the goals and outcomes accessible. At the next HLC assessment in four years, they are going to expect us to have 2 cycles of data completed. The chairs feel they met the goals of making the goals and outcomes accessible. There is a high degree of agreement/consensus between these goals and the LEAP goals.

   c. J. Markgraf questioned why there aren't specific outcomes framed for the last goal. Why is it different than the other goals. Response - the goal was actually the outcome. We see the final goal
for integration and the outcome to address integrating and applying skills and responsibilities within real life contexts. L. Bica - the message from J. Pollitz would address the goal and the outcome could remain as stated in the present draft. J. Pratt - Would it be appropriate to break apart goal 4 - forward J. Pollitz’s suggestions for how to rearticulate this goals. Without any objections we will make a suggestion that we consider J. Pollitz’s suggestion for making this recommendation to Senate and breaking up this goal.

d. B. Nowlan questioned why are the terms skills, knowledge, responsibilities, and integrated bolded and numbered. Chairs response - no conversation about the order or numbering of the outcomes. We didn't intentionally order or number them. If you go to the LEAP website, they are in a different order - this wasn't meant to show a hierarchy. The bolding was intended to highlight the connection to the LEAP goals. J. Pratt - would the committee have an objection to making a recommendation to send on discussion about the liberal education goals and outcomes to align them with the AACU goals from an order standpoint. NOT in a specific numerical order!

e. J. Markgraf - another recommendation by J. Pollitz - the goal includes information literacy but the outcome doesn't really measure that. We suggest altering that to include measures of 'information sources' in the outcomes. Chairs response - we were trying to be more general/broad, rather than measuring specific outcomes - the sense was that within writing, reading, and listening effectively encompassed engaging in effective information literacy skills. J. Pratt clarified - did the chairs discuss it? Not specific suggestions about it. B. Nowlan - there may be two points we want to forward to senate for discussion: 1) integrative learning goal/outcome and 2) inserting information sources in technology into that goal. Chairs response - our challenge was to step outside of our discipline specific goals and outcomes to a broader, more general set of goals that doesn't constrain across disciplines. If we get too specific, it limits what we can measure. The idea is to generalize broader/more global goals rather than having specific detailed goals that don't fit some disciplines. B. Nowlan - doesn't think the senate will be bogged down by wishes to include specific goals that are a bit more discipline specific. On the other hand, we may wish to consider including adding some more specific language to goals to make things measurable. He believes that some won't want to be bogged down by adding too many specific goals that don't generalize across disciplines. D. Mowry - appropriate technologies can really encompass a lot of different things. He is against adding more specific criteria for measurement that would make it less generalizable across disciplines.

f. B. Nowlan discussed D. Shih's suggestions for changing outcomes. D. Shih was invited to the table to discuss his suggestions for conceptual and 'wording' changes. D. Shih - "critical multicultural learning group" - would like to advocate to add awareness/personal awareness to Goal 2. He advocates that all of the associated outcomes 4-7 - to add personal awareness. Personal awareness is critical to learning of inclusivity, diversity, etc. In the courses we ask them to learn about these concepts, it's only fair that we ask them to learn about their own perspectives as well. Goal 3 - suggestion for the word "apply" - to "Assess/Assume" - address skills she/he has developed to demonstrate learning. B. Nowlan - gave the example of the film festival as an example of "assuming" the goals of diversity and inclusivity. Chairs response - we spent 45 min on that wording - it is not perfect but it is a compromise. S. Duckworth-Lawton - highlighting the personal awareness perspective - if we can accommodate personal awareness into goal 4 - 'knowledge' - having that personal awareness is critical to learn about others perspectives. It's different to assess knowledge than perspectives. J. Pratt - suggestion to senate to add personal awareness for goal 2 and outcomes 4-7. B. Nowlan - while knowledge could include personal awareness, including personal awareness would highlight the importance we place on that variable. J. Pratt - With no objection, we will pass along this
suggestion of adding personal awareness to goal 2 and outcomes 4-7.

g. L. Bica - made a suggestion to remove the numbers to goals. Remove numbering to align with AACU from previous recommendation. The earlier recommendation was intended to be a way to reference goals. P. Martin - made a suggestion to retain the bolded words as a way to reference specific goals if we're removing the numbers.

h. B. Nowlan - discussion of removal of the ethical reasoning requirement. S. McAleer is concerned about removing this requirement. J. Pratt - clarified that ULEC and Chairs concluded that ethics is included in outcomes 8, 9 and 10. Chairs response - we cannot include every element. We did have a long discussion about ethics and ethical reasoning. It was a part of the processing of the goals that are now included in goals 8-10. T. Hilton - The words of goal 9 encompass what S. McAleer was concerned about.

i. Goal 3 - for the STEM group, it was very important that students were able to demonstrate the skill of deductive reasoning.

j. L. Bica - P. Ihinger's attempt to make the wording structure parallel. P. Ihinger - speaking as a descending member of ULEC - 4 of the 11 outcomes have the structure use x to . Y. The remaining outcomes are written - Do Y, using X. Chairs response - disagree that it's a simple maneuver of making the sentences/goals parallel. C. Manning’s example was goal 2 outcome 5 - the importance of the elements within the goals relates to how they were ordered/written. If we invert all of these statements to parallelize the wording, we change the meaning of the goals and the importance of elements within the goals. T. Hilton - we talked about the issue of parallelism and decided we were not ready to sacrifice meaning at the interest of form.

k. J. Pratt - reminded us that what we discussed today will be the basis of our recommendations/endorsements to senate next time. B. Nowlan - motion to forward our APC endorsement of the liberal education goals and outcomes as forwarded by ULEC with our added recommendations/suggestions. J. Markgraf seconds it. Motion passed 9 to 0. J. Pratt - if you were planning to change the wording of any outcomes or goals, be prepared to do that at senate next Tuesday

4. Last agenda item - we have coming up global learning and service learning next week.

Secretary for the meeting – J. Hoepner

Meeting closed at 3:00