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1. Chair Pratt called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

2. The minutes of the October 30, 2012 meeting were approved as distributed.

3. APC continued the discussion of Global Learning.

Chair Pratt expressed a concern with requiring 6 credits of Global Learning, stating that requiring 3 credits would not constrain students; completing 3 credits would be more achievable by students, including transfer students.

S. Ducksworth-Lawson brought up real-world concerns indicating that students taking 3 credits would not be prepared for today’s working world. Later in the discussion she stated that a number of students would take 6 credits.

P. Martin does not believe that two courses would make students more prepared; requiring 6 credits would only make it harder for students to graduate.

R. Yelkur stated that the additional three credits is an exception; one three-credit course and an immersion experience is the norm.

The issue of students opting to take the course instead of the immersion experience because they could not afford to go abroad was discussed; the considerable cost of immersion experiences abroad was mentioned.

B. Nolan stated that we have a chance to define ourselves as leaders in relationship to Global Learning. He also said that it would give an indication of our priorities as a university. He gave the example of the writing portfolio that is an option for English students as an example of how students could meet a requirement that is more outcomes-based, suggesting that the requirements for Global learning could move in the same direction.

B. Knight mentioned what UT El Paso is doing with Distance Education while still being able to provide global learning experiences and suggested that the criteria that are used by the Domestic Intercultural Committee at UWEC could be adapted.
J. Markgraf expressed concern about adding more credits to the requirement. She also asked about what would be counted as an equivalent. Chair Pratt clarified that the decision about what counts under the “or equivalent” part of the requirement is determined by ULEC.

L. Bica stated that the requirement can be built into existing courses and she brought up bundling. One course could meet two or three requirements. She also indicated that there is a difference between what is the students’ responsibility and what is our responsibility. We have not met our responsibility to students, according to L. Bica; we need to think about how we are designing something.

J. Olm wanted to know if we are coming back to look at these motions after we have voted on them because the changes made later may have compelled people on the APC to change their minds about how they voted. Chair Pratt indicated that we would come back to the issues after they are further refined.

Motion was moved and seconded to require three credits of global learning and a global learning immersion experience or six credits of global learning. Motion passed with 6 in favor and 3 opposed.

4. APC continued the discussion of Service Learning.

B. Mowry reiterated the concern that were raised at the previous meeting, including the risk management issues that were raised by Provost Klein, but stressed the importance of service learning. The current proposal calls for 30 hours of service learning.

Chair Pratt indicated that she went back to look at AACW’s list of 10 high-impact practices to see how this proposed requirement exemplifies high-impact practices.

J. Prushieck made a statement about what we would lose if we lost service learning, giving student tutoring as an example. Chair Pratt indicated that the discussion is not of eliminating service learning, but of making it part of an array of ways in which students can meet the UWEC learning outcomes.

S. Ducksworth Lawton said that the service learning is important not only for what we give to the community, but also for the necessary social skills and business etiquette that students learn while they meet the requirements for service learning. Service Learning prepares them for the working world.

J. Hoepner indicated that he believes that 30 hours is not a lot of time and that it is a minimum requirement.

It was moved and seconded that the APC adopt ULEC’s proposal to continue requiring 30 hours of service learning. Motion passed with 8 in favor of and 1 opposed.
5. J. Thesing-Ritter opened the discussion about immersion experiences. Some of the immersion experiences are funded by the Blugold Commitments, but projects such as the Civil Rights Pilgrimage are not funded with a BluGold Commitment, causing the students to have to pay more money for such experiences.

It was asked if the Civil Rights Pilgrimage is accompanied by a class or if it is a stand-alone immersion experience. It is currently offered both ways—as a stand-alone and along with a class.

Immersion experiences are high-impact experiences, but they are not affordable to all students.

J. Thesing-Ritter indicated that the infrastructure is slow to be built and that we currently don’t have the infrastructure in place to support a required immersion experience.

APC will continue the discussion of Immersion Experience. J. Thesing-Ritter clarified that all immersion experiences are high-impact practices. High-impact practices represent an umbrella under which immersion experiences exist.

6. Chair Pratt requested Committee member approval to postpone discussion of the final ULEC-proposal components (2-dept/prefix limit and total credits/distribution) until after discussion of the university requirements not included in the ULEC proposal: Wellness, Physical Activity, Foreign Language/Foreign Culture, and Minor. APC is scheduled to discuss the university requirements in the order stated above. This was accepted by APC members.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 3:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie H. Wical, secretary for the meeting