**Interim General Education Oversight Committee**

**Minutes for November 5, 2010**

**320 Little Fine Arts Library**

**Members Present:**

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

Dr. Roxanne Mountford

Dr. Karen Petrone Dr. David Royster Dr. Ben Withers

Dr. Ernie Yanarella

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

Ms. Tara Rose

Mr. Mike Shanks

**Guests Present:** Ms.Joanie Ett‐Mims Ms. Nikki Knutson Ms. Leah Simpson

**Information Items**

1. Rayens opened the meeting with a brief discussion on the vetting process and changes to the Gen Ed website. He reiterated that Course Review Forms were now in Word format and seemed to be a lot more robust than those previously created as Adobe forms.

2. Mr. Greissman and Ms. Knutson lead a discussion on how the issue of credit (Gen Ed and otherwise)

would likely be addressed for Advanced Placement exams.

3. Ms Knutson presented sample packet for what the DUS’s will be asked to do to help with the AP

credit issue.

4. Mr. Greissman reminded us that an AP of 3 or above has to be accepted for some type of credit. He also reminded us that we likely will need an AP sheet of equivalences for December Senate meeting

5. There was some ensuing discussion on how to do the mapping, but agreement that specific courses

should not be mentioned in the mapping, but only the AP score.

6. A suggestion to look at benchmarks to see how they do this AP exercise.

7. A suggestion to make sure there is rigor and quality control present in this AP mapping process.

8. Brief discussion on the rationale for creating special courses (dummy courses) that AP scores would map to. Mr. Shanks and Mr. Greissman led this discussion. Goal was to find something practical that would work within the current U.K. system.

9. General agreement that IGEOC would recommend to departments that an AP score of 4 or higher should be required for Gen Ed course credit. But it will ultimately be up to the departments

10. Discussion returned briefly to item 8. and Mr. Shanks offered to advise the DUSs about how to name dummy courses, if needed.

11. Mr. Greissman volunteered to contact CPE to find out how that body feels about AP scores of 3

12. Mr. Greissman reported on the status of state‐wide discussions about GenEd transfer equivalency issues and described the current revisions

13. Dr. Rayens briefly reported on his meeting with Associate Provost Heidi Anderson

14. Dr. Rayens briefly reported that interviews were taking place for a new Director of Assessment

**Consent Agenda**

• AS 103

• A‐S 130

• TA 120

• TA 140

• EGR 201

• HIS 206

• GWS 201

• PHI 100

• HIS 229

• HIS 230

After a brief discussion on some of these courses, all were approved to send forward. Dr. Rayens was asked to create a couple of sentences describing the Committee’s perspective on EGR 201.

**Discussion Items**

1. ENG 230 and ENG 234 were passed at the IGEOC level as well.

2. Dr. Royster briefly discussed Dual Credit courses. He suggested that artifacts should be collected from those courses as well, and the Committee generally agreed.

3. Proposed language for multi‐sectioned, themed, subtitled, topics courses was further edited and tightened. IGEOC agreed on final product to be submitted to Associate Provost Mullen.

4. The meeting ended with a suggestion to make naming the program a top agenda item at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

**Multi‐sectioned courses: Current Language (Greissman, Withers, Rayens)**

The Committee recommends that multi‐sectioned courses, including themed, subtitled, and topical courses, be handled as follows:

• Departments should submit a single syllabus (aka the “generic” syllabus) for each such course number. This syllabus should provide ample evidence that multi‐sectioned courses adhere to a common set of learning outcomes that are consistent with the curricular area of the GenEd program for which the course has been designed.

• Once the generic syllabus has been approved for Gen Ed, different sections of that course can be

offered as Gen Ed courses for a period of four years, at which time separate syllabi for each section must be submitted for review and approval.

• It is the responsibility of the submitting department to ensure that the syllabi for all sections of a multi‐sectioned course, including themed or sub‐titled courses, adhere over time to the learning outcomes on the generic syllabus.

• Every four years, consistent with the University’s assessment plan, such departments must re‐ submit to the Office of Undergraduate Education (UE) the generic syllabus, along with an accounting of the actual sections offered under that syllabus. The generic syllabus will be reviewed for its consistency with the curricular template in the appropriate area of the GenEd curriculum. Upon successful review in UE the approved generic syllabus will be approved, as a course within the appropriate curricular area of the GenEd curriculum, for another four years. An unsuccessful review would lead to temporary suspension of the approval of the course (and all sections, themes,

subtitles and topics) for General Education credit.

**Additional Comments by Dr. Withers**

[O]ne question that comes up for me is in the last bullet point. “Every four years….” Will this be four years from the time of course approval or will it be that all SR courses are reviewed at the same time at four year intervals? The latter might be more easily administered. Practically, a few courses would be reviewed initially after 1, 2, or 3 years but after that all will be on the same cycle and thus more easily kept track of.