**Interim General Education Oversight Committee**

**Minutes from November 11, 2011**

**Room 231 Student Center, 10 a.m. – Noon.**

**Members Present:** Jonathan Allison Ruth Beattie

Derek Lane Jane Jensen David Royster Ben Withers

**Ex Officios Present:**

Bill Rayens Mike Shanks Debra Sharp

**Guests Present:** Chris Thuringer Leah Simpson

1. Minutes from October 28th were approved by lack of objection.

2. Information Items

 Rayens described the recent visit to Senate Council by a small contingent of IGEOC members.

Rayens emphasized how supportive the Council has been of IGEOC, but advised that the Council did not feel there was a need for it to make any formal statements publicizing and marketing the Core.

 Rayens reminded the Committee that he would be visiting the Senate as part of a December anniversary celebration of IGEOC. The hope is that this time, and communications prior to the visit from the Council Chair, can be used to help remind faculty that the Core belongs to them,

that assessment is critical and worthy, and that upper level course submissions are needed in certain areas.

3. The following courses passed through the consent agenda without objection:

 ENG 107 (Arts and Creativity)

 ARC 333 (Inq in Natural Sci)

 COM 315 (US)

 PHI 130 (US)

4. Leah Simpson and Chris Thuringer updated the group on assessment activities. In general, the fall assessment process is going well, with nearly 50% of all artifacts pulled scored. Participants seem to be comfortable with the process, including the computer infrastructure being used for the scoring. It was noted that there might be a call for revision to the “citizenship” rubric, currently being used to score U.S. and Global course artifacts. IGEOC agreed this was a very positive development that illustrated the faculty ownership of the rubrics and welcomed the IGEOC role in facilitating the revisions.

5. Rayens then asked the group if they wanted to offer a formal proposal to amend vetting process, going from outside reviewers to only in-committee reviewers. Dr. Allison suggested, and it was widely agreed that in-committee reviews were fine in certain circumstances, but it was fairer and more appropriate to keep the review process currently sanctioned by the Senate Council.

6. A discussion of IGEOC and transient students supplanted Honors Courses as the next agenda item and a very intense, informative discussion ensued. Important to that discussion was:

a) Dr. Jensen made the important point that IGEOC has already weighed in on this issue when

the proposal for a transfer committee was penned. See Minutes from September 30, 2011.

b) Rayens acknowledged this important point but tried to clarify that the language of that document and that discussion (leading to the September 30th agreement) was language for transfers, not transients. See below, quoted from the proposal that was approved:

***Non-GETA Transfers:*** *Students transferring from out of state, or from in state private institutions would not fall under the GETA guidelines (“non-GETA” students). This is potentially the most difficult category that the Exceptions Subcommittee will have to deal with. IGEOC proposes the following for courses being transferred by such students …*

c) It was not clear if IGEOC intended this to be a policy for transients as well as transfers.

d) Mike Shanks corrected Rayens with respect to some misunderstandings that Rayens had with respect to GETA and non-GETA students, but Rayens continued to press for clarification on transients. Rayens and Dr. Beattie spoke to the need for this clarification from the perspective of DUS. Rayens also pointed out that the Council on Post-Secondary Education had offered the opinion that each University had the right to have their own transient policy.

e) Dr. Jensen pointed out that it is the faculty purview to manage the curriculum and not to manage the students and how and where they decide to take courses while enrolled at U.K. IGEOC was generally in agreement with that sentiment.

f) Some members had to leave before noon, but in the end it became clear that what everyone was calling for was a clear and unambiguous statement about how the University wants to handle transient students, one that is driven by a vision of what is fair to students and at the same time protects as much as reasonable the integrity of the Core. IGEOC wanted that policy to be driven by a coherent and informed vision and not just by the inability of our registration system to distinguish transfers from transients. Members suggested at the very end of the meeting that this was the something that either the CPE or perhaps the President and Provost would need to speak clearly on.

g) Mike Shanks raised a critical point about advising that the Committee wanted recorded: Advisors need to be trained in how to explain and promote UKCore. This may include helping students recognize what they lose when they (by choice or circumstance) take courses outside the university.

7. The meeting had adjourned before the important topic of Honor courses and the Core could be discussed. An informal discussion on this topic continued but cannot be taken as a reflection of any official opinion on the part of IGEOC since most members had left by that time.