**Interim General Education Oversight Committee**

**Minutes from Meeting on July 14th, 9‐11 a.m. in POT 851**

**Members Present:**

Dr. Ruth Beattie Dr. Heather Bush Dr. Derek Lane

Dr. Roxanne Mountford

Dr. Karen Petrone

Dr. Bill Rayens

Dr. David Royster

Dr. Ben Withers

Dr. Ernie Yanarella

**Ex Officio Present:**

Richard Greissman

**Guest Present:**

Nikki Knutson

The IGEOC met to address the attached agenda. A summary of the meeting follows.

1. Meeting opened with a brief discussion on how to better organize the deluge of emails that the group is exchanging. It was suggested that we look at a new tool in Google (Google Wave) that allows you to thread your discussion in a rational way. Rayens agreed to look into that.

2. Committee agreed to an understanding that all emails will be shared with the entire group unless

otherwise instructed by the sender.

3. Agreed to send a letter to all Assoc Deans going forward about the process change (in forms). Deal with those who have already submitted differently. Nikki Knutson will send this letter.

4. Agreed to revisit templates and make sure that expected student experiences are more directly mentioned in the checklists. It was agreed that if this was done carefully on all the templates then the concerns being raised by Dr. Grabau as to the focus of the checklists would be addressed.

5. Agreed that it is appropriate for the checklists to have some language about what the instructor is going to do in the classroom and not just fully about what the student is going to learn,. This was suggested as appropriate because the checklist resides between the Template area outcomes and the classroom. It is, in part, a check on the proposed reasonableness of implementation.

6. It was agreed that on the checklist, under “brief description” that the Committee was only looking

for 2 or 3 sentences to show at least example on the syllabus. If there were multiple instances on the syllabus where a certain checkbox was addressed, it was not necessary for the submitter to indicate all of those.

7. Committee acknowledged the need to revisit the tone of some of the checklists (move toward a more positive tone and away from one that inadvertently suggests that past efforts may not have been adequate).

8. In order to distinguish the various outcomes in this process , it was agreed that we would use the following language, or similar language, designed to help us keep the outcomes straight:

a. Program Level Learning Outcomes will refer to the four overarching outcomes for the

General Education Program.

b. Curricular Area Learning Outcomes will refer to the work of the template committees and the outcomes each developed for the different areas.

c. Student Learning Outcomes will refer to those listed on individual faculty syllabi.

9. Suggestion made, group agreed to include the clarifying language in item 9 above on either the General Education website or on part of the documentation that course submitters will be accessing.

10. Agreed to propose language for Senate adoption that specifies how assessment data can be used,

indicating that it can only be used for Program Level assessments and cannot be used to evaluate a particular faculty member or her class. Suggested that phrases like “drilling down” stop being used.

11. Suggestion made that the Committee should go around to each College to explain what we have been doing, including the language distinctions (thought to grow in importance when discussion of assessment arise). Agreed that the Committee would be available for such meetings as soon as checklists are available.

12. Tentatively agreed that each submitted proposal would be reviewed as followd:

a. The review will initially involve two people: the corresponding Area Expert on the IGEOC and a person not on the IGEOC chosen by the Area Expert who, if possible, has taught a similar course in the past.

b. If these two do not agree on the outcome of the submission, then a third person will be

identified to also do the review and that review will serve as the tie breaker.

c. If there are no special problems with outcome of the process outlined in parts a. and b., the result will be brought to the full IGEOC (can be by way of email) for a pro forma vote. If special issues have arisen then a more detailed discussion will be had in full Committee.

13. Committee is still unsure how to efficiently connect this process to the Undergraduate Council.

More discussion will have to be had here. The Committee felt strongly that this needs to be a highly efficient process so that the Undergraduate Council cannot undo what the IGEOC has done, nor do they have to redo it. Part of what is still unclear here is how additional forms such as new course forms will be handled, or if they will even be part of what the IGEOC sees. One suggestion was that the entire process (including new course forms) be handled on the IGEOC. If a problem arises in the review, then the issue is brought to the full IGEOC, and if no resolution is possible there, it goes to

the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies for a final opinion.

14. Suggestion that we have access to some sort of clear routing information (may be able to make this electronic) so that we will know the submissions have been through the college level committees.

15. It was agreed that the templates would be sent back to the original template committees for review before becoming final.

16. Brief discussion at the end, as people were leaving about how explicitly to include Information Literacy on the checklists. This was not resolved in the meeting but a follow up email was sent at a later time.