

**Interim General Education Oversight Committee  
Tentative Agenda for September 24, 2010**

**Information Items (10 minutes)**

1. Update on vetting process (problems, fine tuning)
2. Gen Ed website and Sharepoint site have been under continual revision (have a look)
3. Remember visit with Vice President Ray on October 1<sup>st</sup> (see discussion item)

**Items ready for a vote (10 minutes)**

1. MA revised the language relating to IL (for MA 113 and MA 137) and these revisions were circulated. All who responded replied they now met the standard set out in the templates and should move forward. We need to vote on this as a committee.
2. LA 111: Recommendation from Dr. Ben Withers that this submission should move forward (2-0 vote by referees). Have a look at the referee comments and come prepared to vote.
3. TA 130: Recommendation from Dr. Ben Withers that this submission should move forward (2-0 vote by referees). Have a look at the referee comments and come prepared to vote.
4. TA 300: Recommendation from Dr. Ben Withers that this submission should move forward (2-0 vote by referees). Have a look at the referee comments and come prepared to vote.

**Items to discuss (maximum of 20 minutes per item unless some are surprisingly quick)**

1. How to deal with submissions that ask for a k-course sequence,  $k > 1$ , to satisfy a Gen Ed area
  - a. PSY 215 and PSY 216<sup>i</sup> <sup>ii</sup>
  - b. Update on CHE 105 and CHE 111<sup>iii</sup> <sup>iv</sup>
2. How to handle topics courses with subtitles<sup>v</sup>
3. Whether or not Gen Ed courses can be closed to majors<sup>vi</sup>

*If time permits*

4. What role you see GEOC playing in Gen Ed assessment<sup>vii</sup>
5. How to proceed with naming of the curriculum<sup>viii</sup>

---

<sup>i</sup> De facto time in Gen Ed and to graduation are partly at issue; have to be careful that Gen Ed isn't 30 hours on paper but appreciably more in practice for a significant group of students. Advice to allow these rational pairings should perhaps come with revised instructions that require a formal outcomes map from the k courses to the template outcomes. This could come in the form of a cover to the syllabi. Course approval form would need to distinguish syllabi.

<sup>ii</sup> GEOC member's comments received in absentia expressed view that a k-course sequence should be approved only if it can be mapped to k area in the Gen Ed curriculum (e.g. Inquiry in Social Sciences, Inferential Reasoning)

---

<sup>iii</sup> This course sequence probably should not have been sent forward as approved, but only “content approved” in the same way PSY 215 and 216 were categorized.

<sup>iv</sup> GEOC member’s comments received in absentia expressed concern over the proposed removal of the discussion portion of CHE 105 and did not feel it would be readily approved if it reappeared without that portion.

<sup>v</sup> GEOC member’s comments received in absentia expressed opinion in favor of this, provided a single syllabus could be constructed with enough specificity to allow clear mapping to template outcomes, but with enough generality to allow different topics, that fit under that same syllabus, to be taught without re vetting.

<sup>vi</sup> In the old USP any Gen Ed course was supposed to be open to all. This has not been addressed formally and GEOC needs to advise.

<sup>vii</sup> Please think about before the meeting with Dr. Ray

<sup>viii</sup> Partially because of the need to advertise and explain the program to new students and their families