Members Present: Chuck Booth, Hope Cook, Richard Jones-Bamman, Maggie Martin, Delar Singh, Carol Williams, Bob Wolf

1. Review and acceptance of draft minutes of 26 May (Wolf, Booth). Accepted with abstention, Jones-Bamman.

Old Business

2. Committee membership and liaisons
   There remain three vacant seats on the committee. There is a seat for faculty from the library, the School of Education and Professional Studies (not Education) and a Senator. Members of the committee will announce these vacancies to recruit interested persons. A Senate election will be held on September 19 for these seats.

3. LAC Course Submission Process
   The course submission process continues to be refined. The LAPC forms have been posted on our web site. Curriculum Committee is finalizing its forms which should be approved and posted later this week. The deans of the Schools of Arts and Sciences and Education and Professional Studies will be contacted to offer a presentation to department chairs. A demonstration of the process will be conducted at the next LAPC meeting.

4. ICE Working Groups and Task Groups
   a. Reports of working groups and discussion of recommendations and next steps
      Members discussed the final reports of each of the working groups. Each of the liaisons will review the documents for presentation at upcoming meetings of the LAPC to determine next stages for implementation.

   b. Information Technology task group
      The information technology task group has piloted the Prentice Hall test at orientation weekend with 80 students. Students in one CSC 100 and one business information systems class also took the test. Alex Citurs managed the details of this pilot well. A great deal will be learned through this effort not only about student proficiencies but also about implementing a test of all incoming students. A report will be prepared for an upcoming LAPC meeting.

5. LAPC Policies
   The LAPC policies approved at the May meeting have been posted on the LAPC “feedback” page on our website. Two minor edits were made in this document to clarify that the Curriculum Committee determined which classes could be removed from the LAC and that Tier III courses could be designated as majors or minors only (this includes major concentrators for the BGS Program as well), The new document will be posted.

New Business

6. First Year Program
   A member of the LAPC has a seat on the First Year Program Committee. Richard Jones-Bamman volunteered to again be the LAPC representative. He was approved by consensus.

7. Faculty Development Activities – CEE
   Stacey Close has agreed to host at least faculty development workshop in the fall on visual communication and host a conference during the spring semester on ethics. Chairs of these working groups have been contacted to begin the planning process.

Next Meeting: 18 September 2006

Minutes respectfully submitted,

Maggie Martin, Chair
1. Review of minutes of September 11, 2006

Old Business

2. LAC Course Submission Process
http://www.easternct.edu/depts/sociology/socialwork/LAPC/LACApp.htm

3. ICE Working Groups and Task Groups
   a. Reports of working groups and discussion of recommendations and next steps
      Information Literacy
      Critical Thinking
      Communications
      Ethics

      Andrew will not be the liaison – need liaison for communication – wait for election?
      Discuss continuation of groups – alternatives for Information Literacy
      Senate action

   b. Information Technology task group
      Report for next week and Senate

4. LAPC Policies
   a. Hold forums
   b. Assess need for Senate action

New Business

5. Senate representative 9/19/06

6. Honors Program Policies

7. Transfer Student Policies
   a. Determine the phase-in process

8. Faculty Development Activities – CEE

9. Capacity Planning

10. First Year Program

11. University Relations

12. Support Staff Development

1. Assessment
   a. Liaison
   b. Refine concepts – integration, engagement, independence
   c. ? shall these be outcomes for the LAP, LAC and/or University
   d. NSSE assessing student engagement – how they spend their time – do we use? Data?