**Interim General Education Oversight Committee**

**Minutes from February 4, 2011**

**Room 228, Student Center, 11 a.m. – 1 p.m.**

**Members Present:**

Ruth Beattie Larry Grabau Derek Lane Jane Jensen

Roxanne Mountford

Karen Petrone David Royster Ben Withers Ernie Yanarella

**Ex Officios and Guests Present:**

Richard Greissman

Nikki Knutson Bill Rayens Mike Shanks Debbie Sharp

**Information Items**

1. Rayens reminded the Area Experts that they are an official subcommittee of Undergraduate

Council and, as such, they are to check proposals for the same things that the Council would, including incomplete or improper syllabi.

2. Assistant Provost Nikki Knutson provided an update on the on-going AP/CLEP/IBP exercise.

There was considerable discussion on the how Biology and Psychology chose to do their credit mappings. There was also considerable debate on the interpretation of HB 160 and what implications it had for the AP transfer discussion. Also some discussion on IBP credit in English and Math not being awarded for SL level performance.

Rayens was asked to contact Engineering to make sure they know that their calculus course has not been approved for General Education.

Dr. Jensen advised Ms. Knutson to rearrange the Quantitative Foundations chart so that

Earth Sciences courses were not the first ones on the list.

Finally, Ms. Knutson noted that the ACT/SAT requirements still had to be compiled.

**Consent Agenda**

 MCL 100 (Inquiry in Humanities)

2. GEO 130 (Inquiry in the Natural, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences)

3. ANT 230 (Inquiry in the Natural, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences)

All courses on the Consent Agenda were approved

**Out-of-Meeting Approvals**

So that they might be read into the minutes, Rayens noted that the following courses had been approved by email vote (since last meeting).

1. CLA 135

3. FR 225

4. HIS 202

5. HIS 203

6. ID 161

7. ID 162

8. ANT 102

9. AST 191

**Discussion Items**

1. Leah Simpson, Office of Assessment, addressed the group regarding some critical assessment decisions that need to be made. A substantive discussion ensued that generated a lot of important questions. A decision was made to convene a high-level meeting to address these questions prior to the next IGEOC meeting.

2. Rayens asked IGEOC for advice on the proper way to approach the Senate Council with IGEOC recommendations. Rayens was advised to reword the proposed policy language making the statement stronger and in the form of a motion.

3. IGEOC’s position was revisited on reviewing courses from study abroad or international transfer programs thought to satisfy a set of template outcomes. Committee members suggested that these courses needed to be mapped to the outcomes and that course review forms should be utilized when appropriate.