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Guests: David Baker, Margaret Cassidy, Jennifer Fager, Marc Goulet, Deb Jansen, Bob Knight, Jill Prushiek, Carter Smith, Analisa DeGrave, Laurel Kieffer, Debbie Gough, Michael Weil, Mary Hoffman, Carmen Manning, Theresa Kemp, Debra Barker, Alex Smith, Diane Hoadley

Chair Pratt called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm.

1. The minutes of the November 27, 2012 meeting were approved as distributed.

2. Liberal Education Reform
   a) 2-prefix limit discussion and vote:
      - Discussed various options, including prefix limit, number of unique prefixes requirement, and no limit or requirement regarding prefixes.
      - J. Pratt posed the question of how we ensure breadth
      - B. Nowlan asked that APC consider no limits or restrictions on prefixes in order to potentially offer students greater flexibility.
      - M. Goulet commented that with an outcomes-based liberal education model, if ULEC does its job correctly, breadth will be achieved through outcomes and a prefix requirement is not essential
      - D. Gough pointed out the prefixes are arbitrary; some departments can have multiple prefixes

      Motion was made and seconded: No more than two courses of the 42 credits of liberal education course work may be completed from any single departmental or program course prefix. Vote: Yes-0; No-9. Not supported.

      Motion was made and seconded: Liberal education core will include no prescription or limitation on the number of courses or credits that students can take from any single departmental or program course prefix. Vote: yes-9; No-0. Motion supported.

   b) Required minor:
      - Chair Pratt clarified that APC's role in this decision would be advisory only. She asked that the discussion focus on question and issues that APC needs to consider in order to make a recommendation on the required minor in the spring.
      - B. Nowlan said he would like more feedback from students on how they felt about a required minor.
P. Martin reported that on discussions of the Student Senate Executive Board meeting and others from Student Senate. The general sense was that the required minor serves as a useful tool to segue students into majors, but an outcomes-based curriculum would achieve the same goal of exposing students to a breadth of courses. Alternatives, like increased access to certificate programs as per the UW-Madison model, should be considered. Facilitating graduation in four years remains a priority.

D. Baker said that the Chairs’ Council will be discussing the required minor issue and will forward its report to APC. He reported that there are a variety of opinions in A&S. Some areas rely on minors for the majority of student hours. He suggested that alternatives, such as requiring one or two certificates, to the required minor be considered as well.

D. Barker spoke of the importance of the required minor to the American Indian Studies (AIS) program. She said that the minors sustain the major program. She spoke about the value of the AIS minor to students, as it uniquely prepares students to step into a job market and culture with the ability to work with and understand people unlike themselves.

C. Smith spoke about a language minor and expressed concern that a certificate would not meet the same needs as a minor. He also questioned the minor’s effect on 4 year graduation.

S. Duckworth-Lawton also questioned the effect of the required minor on graduation rates, acknowledging that the issue is different for transfer students.

B. Knight stated that our problems with retention of transfer students are in part because of the required minor.

D. Gough said that there is no single reason that students don’t graduate in 4 years. There are myriad causes for students to get out of sync with 4 year graduation plans, but whatever the reason, the 24 credits of the required minor limit their options for getting back on track in a timely manner.

T. Kemp spoke in support of the required minor, citing the unique characteristics of many of our students who benefit from the nudge of faculty and advisors to explore different fields and try new things. The minor offers this opportunity.

A. Smith spoke of the effect of removing the minor requirement on the 60-credit majors. Academic policies regarding majors would have to be reconsidered. He also expressed concern over what would happen to minor-dependent programs.

M. Hoffman suggested that we consider allowing departments to require minors or certificates, explaining why this would be beneficial for Communication and Journalism students as an example.

L. Bica asked for data demonstrating the outcomes of minors on students. The suggestion was made that the Chairs’ Council include this data in its report.

A. DeGrave reported on feedback from Latin American Studies (LAS) students. They felt that the minor was a good way to have a cluster of classes that was purposeful.

3. Outcomes-based approach to liberal education reform.
- Discussion began on the APC framework proposal. Chair Pratt noted that the current APC proposal does not explicitly address the ethical reasoning requirement or the communication-intensive requirement from the ULEC proposal. APC will have to consider how to incorporate these requirements into the framework.
- APC will also have to consider how to bring in university requirements and connect them to the liberal education learning goals and outcomes.
- Next week’s meeting will focus on transitioning from the ULEC framework proposal to the APC proposal. Suggestions should be sent to Chair Pratt by Thursday.

4. Posthumous Guidelines
   Motion was made and seconded to endorse the posthumous baccalaureate degree based on the full array of criteria presented by the Provost at the last meeting. Vote: yes-8; No-1. Motion supported.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jill Markgraf, secretary for the meeting