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| Psychology Program Review | The Department of Psychology Program Review was discussed. Questions from the APC mainly focused on the following:  

*Advising* – Chair Matthews described proposed strategies for advising assessment and improvement but these are on hold at present in case an “advising center” will be formed by the College, or possibly plans are underway for a centralized university advising center. These are approaches that may currently be under discussion in the Chancellor’s Rapid Action Task Forces.  

*Workload* – question about workload implications (what is the department planning to drop?) in light of exploring new curriculum pathways such as an interdisciplinary major in neuroscience. Chair Matthews addressed this in the context of providing and prioritizing new opportunities for students in a rapidly changing world, and specifically discussed three priorities: 1) importance of faculty time management and ability to spend more time in their areas of expertise, 2) an engaged department which is open about decision-making and where ideas are debated, and 3) the great strength in the department of faculty-student engagement.  

*Culture of the department* – Chair’s goal is to enhance the Department’s ability to function as a unit, and a retreat is planned for August. | Chair Matthews attended to answer any committee questions regarding the self-study documentation, and the Departmental response to internal and external reviews.  

Chair Pratt thanked guests and she will forward a written summary of APC’s program review recommendations to Vice-Chancellor Kleine. |
**Proposal to remove the Foreign Language admissions requirement:**  

This proposal was presented by the Director of Admissions, Heather Kretz (for Carter Smith, Chair of Foreign Languages). Concerns acknowledged & addressed in the presentation included whether students would be coming in less prepared if we do not have this requirement. The Department Chair doesn’t see it as a problem for non-majors or FL majors coming in, usually only 1 or 2 of 26 are true beginners. Bica reported that the College of A&S retains the language requirement, and asked whether dropping this admission requirement would result in Language having to create remedial classes? The suggestion was made that perhaps enough students would be attracted into one class for true beginners.

Another concern expressed was whether this proposal would be perceived as a lowering of standards. What are we signaling to the community? APC member (Ducksworth–Lawton) felt that the business community would want the requirement retained. Other discussion followed regarding the cognitive ability and window of time for language learning. Gannon stated that Art & Music learning is somewhat similar, but we need them “where they are.” Chair Kaldjian stated he wouldn’t like the idea of having (30) students who didn’t get in because of these requirements; it’s a societal issue and he would want the opportunity to teach those students too. Bica supports a more holistic approach vs piecemeal changes to admissions. She objects to removal of FL as opposed to any of the other admission requirements. All other admission requirements are from UW System. Our University can only change the FL requirement.

Discussion followed about creating opportunities to teach more students, and about approximately how many we lose because of this requirement. Many don’t apply; they don’t even consider coming here because other campuses do not have this requirement.

Nowlan noted that we should hear the Rapid Action Task Force (RATF) reports before we can really assess this proposal. Otherwise, this change is just piecemeal and may meet more opposition if we do not view it as part of the larger picture. The point was made that this action is problematic because we are considering it in isolation when it’s connected to what we’ll do about the LE Core. Also any modifications that are perceived as lowering standards (by the Senate) will receive resistance. Whatever our decision, we must think of this change strategically as part of a larger transformation in the university.

Moved by J Pratt  
Seconded by D Mowry  
Motion Passed 7:2
Student Senator Kielman framed the issue as one of injustice to reject potential incoming students because of where they went to high school. To discriminate against students who didn’t have the opportunity (to come in with FL requirements completed) is a disservice to UWEC and our community. Chair Kaldjian: It’s all about inclusiveness: “It’s more important who we send away (graduate) from here than who we bring here.”

In reality, we really do not have a competitive advantage in this area. LaCrosse is Madison’s #1 competitor; we are not. Apparently high school counselors (North & Memorial) counsel students against applying to us if they do not have 2 yrs of FL.

(Mowry): In practical terms, given our funding situation, it would not only give students more opportunity, admitting more students would help with our budget and enrollment.

In reality, the FL requirement may not represent part of being college-ready; students are currently self-selecting out.

Following discussion, a vote was taken on the motion: “APC recommends removal of the current FL admissions requirement”

| Upcoming agenda items: program reviews, UG Catalog changes to Physical Activity and Wellness. |
| Next week’s meeting: Tuesday April 14th |
| Council Oak Room, Davies 260 |

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM