**General Education Policy Review Committee**

**Minutes of the February 25 Meeting**

Present: Don Guay, Nisha Fernando, Randy Olson, James Sage, Robert Sirabian, Greg Summers, Mary Holland.

Called to order at 3:39pm.

The minutes of Feb 18 were approved.

Announcements:

1. Step 4 update from Academic Affairs Committee.

AAC passed Step 4 on Monday; so now it’s on its way to Faculty Senate next week. Please show up to Faculty Senate on March 3rd at 3pm.

1. There is proposal for a Gen Ed standing committee to oversee and approve all Gen Ed curriculum courses, coming out of the Academy Team. This way Assessment can close the loop to inform the Committee. The committee voted and a quorum would like to send a recommendation for approval for this proposal from GEPRC.

Old Business:

1. Update from the AAC&U conference in Seattle.

Nisha brought materials back from the Association of American Colleges and Universities conference.: “*Assessing Outcomes and Improving Achievement: Tips and Tools for Using Rubrics*” “*Mapping Interdisciplinary Studies*” “*Globalizing Knowledge: Connecting International and Intercultural Studies*” “*Why Do I Have to Take this Course?: A Student Guide to Making Smart Educational Choices*.” Nisha described how the Gen Ed curriculum structure is presented to students from the beginning as to why the required courses are required/considered important.

1. Discussion of Step 5.

The committee discussed if the general education statement about instructor criteria needs to be slightly different for First Year Seminar and Experiential Learning to encourage those who wouldn’t ordinarily teach a course, someone with practical expertise to teach these? For example, would “Faculty/Staff” include Student Affairs? Greg will ask Mick Veum what language we should use to be inclusive of as many people as we can.

The committee discussed if English and Communication needs more rigorously defined instructor criteria. Under “course criteria” we could say only specific courses meet these learning outcomes OR we could leave it more open. We want to define these by the learning outcomes. Do we want to specify courses or not? The committee discussed that if we don’t want to privilege any department, then we need a rationale if we make an exception.

The committee discussed when looking at the instructors’ criteria the Gen Ed curriculum is owned by the entire university versus any departmental curriculum. An actual collaboration between disciplines would be good for Interdisciplinary courses.

The committee discussed trying to examine the instructor criteria as an alternative to the way Step 5 is written now. For example: the committee could go through and define Instructors Criteria for each department. There is a difference between adjusting in response to a demand/need verses people who want to cross disciplines just because they can. The committee considered should we go out in teams and talk to each department? Ask them what do you think of this criterion? We are doing the Survey to generate feedback also.

Adjourned at 5:39pm.

Respectfully submitted by Mary Holland.