**Interim General Education Oversight Committee**

**Minutes from Meeting on June 23rd, 2‐4 p.m. in POT 145**

**Members Present:** Dr. Heather Bush Dr. Derek Lane

Dr. Roxanne Mountford

Dr. Karen Petrone

Dr. Bill Rayens

Dr. David Royster

Dr. Ben Withers

Dr. Ernie Yanarella

**Members with report or update received in absentia:**

Dr. Ruth Beattie Dr. Larry Grabau Dr. Jane Jensen

**Visitor:**

Richard Greissman

The IGEOC met to address the attached agenda. A summary of the meeting follows. **The Committee agreed to have the next iteration of drafts available by Friday, July 2nd**. These are to be submitted to Dr. Rayens (rayens@uky.edu) who will then create one pdf file and distribute it to the full IGEOC for a second round of editing.

1. Members introduced themselves; the charge and duties of the IGEOC were reviewed.

2. A general discussion ensued regarding the draft checklists that were submitted by Committee members. The group decided that it would not be productive to try to wordsmith each draft, but rather to focus on larger issues. To that end, the following agreements emerged:

a) Format of checklists should be very similar across all areas

b) Each checklist should be a document that is largely filled out by the submitter as part of the initial submission packet. It should direct the submitter to specify where each item to be checked is found in the syllabus.

c) Each checklist should be formatted using Intellectual Inquiry – Arts and Creativity (attached) as a model.

d) Each checklist should be faithful to the wording of the template and the scale of each checklist should similar in their level of specificity.

3. Other issues directly related to the checklists were discussed. In particular, the Committee agreed:

a) That we don’t want to create forms that are a barrier to submission.

b) To check with the template committees to see if they had a pathway in mind that might be important to getting students to a particular learning outcome. Practically, this might mean that the Committee have the original template chairs review the checklists, once finished, just to make sure they faithfully reflect original intent.

c) To use positive language in the checklists, borrowed directly from the templates whenever possible

(e.g. want to avoid phrases like “does the course go beyond merely doing …”). d) To have some common preamble on each checklist that explained the purpose.

4. Other items were discussed and the Committee agreed:

a) To press for the creation of a state of the art, completely electronic submission and review system. b) To periodically debrief the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Communication, and Fine Arts as to the

Committee progress.

c) To invite Richard Greissman, Mike Shanks, and Marsha Watson to be an ex‐Officio members. d) There needs to be some departmental accountability wrt multi‐sectioned courses. General

sentiment that there should be only one syllabus for any multi‐sectioned course.

e) That it was feasible to have a single course count toward either of two areas. It was agreed that such a course should have a single syllabus that was broad enough to support such a broad application and that any such course would, of course, only count for one of the areas, not both.

f) That the new General Education program needs to be named as soon as possible; the

Committee agreed to offer suggestions on how this might be done.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. No subsequent face‐to‐face meeting was scheduled at this time.