**Interim General Education Oversight Committee**

**November 19, 2010 Meeting**

**320 Little Fine Arts Library**

**Minutes for November 19, 2010**

**Members Present:**

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

Dr. David Royster

Dr. Ben Withers

Dr. Ernie Yanarella

**Ex Officios Present:** Mr. Richard Greissman Dr. Bill Rayens

Mr. Mike Shanks

**Guests Present:** Ms. Nikki Knutson Ms. Leah Simpson

**Information Items**

1. Rayens updated those present on the vetting progress and encouraged any AE who needed help getting proposals out and reviewed to ask for help.

2. Greissman and Rayens reported on the November Senate meeting where there was a “first reading” of the upcoming Gen Ed vote. Questions raised by Senators were communicated to the Committee and discussed in some detail. Both Greissman and Rayens encouraged Committee members to come to the December Senate meeting.

**Consent Agenda**

1. A‐S 200 was the only course on the Consent Agenda. A question was raised with respect to contact hours and how they were distributed in the description. In particular, members wanted the proposers to rephrase the “75 hours out of class studio time” and not have that as part of the direct contact time. Suggestion for rephrasing: “students will be expected to spend x number of hours per week outside of class” Decision to move this out of IGEOC, with the understanding that this language needed to be changed before the course could move forward to Undergraduate Council.

**Discussion Items**

1. Future of GEOC: A member of the Senate had asked for some indications of what the future would be for the current (interim) oversight committee. Comments from Associate Provost Mike Mullen were circulated to the Committee in advance.

Since the Committee seems to be working very effectively as organized and charged, members felt it should continue functioning into the future much as it is now. It was also suggested that for the foreseeable future IGEOC (and its successor) should perhaps be asked to submit a quarterly report to the Senate Council.

The Committee recognizes that it is likely to develop an ongoing role in new‐course vetting, course monitoring (particularly for subtitled and special topics offerings), as well as in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the University’s Gen Ed assessment plan and the faculty‐ driven evolution of associated assessment rubrics. But these details all have to be worked out by the Senate Council, in conjunction with the Senate and the Undergraduate Council. The Committee did want to state unequivocally that it is their belief that matters involving Gen Ed are curriculum matters and, as such, are in the hands of the faculty and their governing bodies, implying that the composition and function of IGEOC should be jointly administered by the Senate Council, the Senate, and the Undergraduate Council.

1. Naming the Program. Suggestions from the Provost and the IGEOC were pooled and were discussed at great length. A variety of positions and perspectives populated the discussion, but in the end the entire Committee agreed to suggest ***The UK‐CORE: 21st Century Studies*** for the name. It was also suggested that were this name to be adopted by the Senate, that a contest be organized through the appropriate University office to allow students to design a logo for tee shirts bearing the new name.

2. Issues regarding DSP and Honors. Briefly said, the discussion revolved around if and how to vet DSP and Honor courses. Comments defining these issues were circulated in advance from Associate Provost Mike Mullen. A lengthy discussion ensued and no decision was expected. However, the Committee did reach strong consensus on the following:

• The Honors Program should see this discussion as a provocation for curricular innovation. Part of the confusion is that there is no clearly stated purpose for the Honors Program and some wider discussion is needed. Only then can IGEOC advise on whether Honors somehow lives above the General Education “core” and should be broadly exempted, or whether like other programs they should be required to map all their courses to the Gen Ed learning outcomes and have those courses vetted. Suggestion to invite the Director of Honors to meet with IGEOC and discuss this further.

• The Discovery Program was seen in a different light than the Honors Program.

Committee members felt that those who develop courses for DSP should be asked to fill out the course review forms, just like everyone else. A suggestion that the DSP Director could sign off on those forms as meeting Gen Ed requirements was not generally well received and the Committee resolved to ask the DSP program to submit courses for review in the usual way.

3. Language regarding multi‐sectioned, themed, subtitled, and topics courses was still under review and was not discussed.

4. FAQ list. A draft was circulated in advance and discussed briefly. Committee members agreed this was not the most pressing item before them at this time and it could be delayed.