Minutes
Attendees: Chris Ault, Alma Khasawneh, June Kim, Andrea LaMorticella, Christopher Murphy, Anne Peel, Nina Ringer, Catherine Rosemurgy

1. Review of 2/7/24 Minutes
   a. approved

2. Update on CAP review of FYW 102 proposal
   a. CAP will seek testimony
   b. More analysis of disaggregated data was completed

3. Review of proposal to add Global Designation to multiple WLC courses
   a. Committee voted to decline blanket Global designation for all WLC 101, 102 and 103 courses
   b. Members felt that while the assignments listed in the syllabi did provide exposure to the culture of the target language, they did not include sustained, scaffolded assignments that explicitly engaged students in critically evaluating those norms, values and practices.
   c. If the WLC Department wants to move ahead with seeking the global designations, we suggest:
      i. The language acquisition happening in 101 and 102 level courses is so intensive and important. We wondered how much of that might have to be sacrificed in order to include enough assignments that would meet the level of critical evaluation for the global designation.
ii. Faculty might consider taking one of the syllabi at the 103 level (or another course that they think has the most rigorous global content) and substantially revising it. The revisions should detail discussion prompts and topics in the course schedule, prompts for larger assignments such as papers or presentations, evaluation guidelines, etc. that engage students in critical evaluation.

4. Designation proposal for review if time allows
   
a. CRI 303 - Behavioral, Social, or Cultural Perspectives
   
i. Approve with minor revision: The committee felt that the topics and the textbook for the course indicated that students in the course will learn how human thought, emotion, and behavior affect and are affected by relationships or institutions at the level of the individual, culture, or society. However, the connection between course assignments and meeting the learning outcomes needed to be made more explicit. Specifically, members asked for the following:

   1. Explain how the reaction paper will engage students in the outcome.
   
   2. Explain how the case study and final presentation will engage students in the outcome.
   
   3. Minor revision: Change “Corps Objective” to “College Corps Objective”