**General Education Program Review Ad Hoc Committee**

*Friday, February 5, 2016*

3:00 p.m.

Thomas Edison (Lee) Campus: AA-168

Collier: M-120A

**Minutes**

**Attendees**: Professor Don Ransford, Dr. Eileen DeLuca, Dr. Rebecca Harris, Dr. Brian Page, Jane Charles, Dr. Wendy Chase, Dr. Lisa McGarity

The committee approved the minutes from the December, 2015 meeting.

Don thanked committee members for their work and congratulated them on a successful initial implementation.

The *General Education Council* proposal went to Faculty Senate as an information item. For the next Faculty Senate meeting, the proposal will be an action item for members to vote on.

The committee discussed the upcoming Meeting of the Minds workshops. The schedule is almost finalized. Don will send the schedule to Melissa Rizzuto with the workshop summary and objectives and she will schedule and market to faculty. For each of the eight competencies, the entire sentence will be added to the session title so that faculty do not focus only on the initial verb.

The committee discussed ideas for facilitating the Meeting of the Minds sessions.

* Facilitators may want to bring copies of the extended definitions and take notes on suggested revisions.
* Facilitators may want to bring copies of sample assignments or activities from their own or other courses that exemplify the competency.
* Facilitators may want to invite faculty to share ideas about how they interpret the competency and/or how they realize the competency in their discipline and/or courses.
* Facilitators may want to bring a sample of the form and be prepared to answer questions about how to complete the “Faculty Worksheet for Course Outline Roman Numeral IV.”

The committee discussed revisions to the General Education Competencies.

* There have been suggestions for tweaking either competencies or extended definitions from some faculty.
* More suggestions may come as a result of Meeting of the Mind Sessions.
* It was noted that changes to the actual competencies will involve additional vetting due to future publication in the catalog, but the extended definitions can change without additional vetting.
* Rebecca will resend the link for the Google document so that committee members can continue to share revisions and comments.

The committee discussed initial implementation and suggestions for providing additional support and clarification to departments. Joe van Gaalen and Eileen had begun to create a presentation that could be used within the departments. This came out of requests by faculty in terms of use of the form, and general curriculum revision. The presentation can include any other items as suggested by GEPR.

Clarification items suggested by GEPR:

* When choosing integral or supplemental competency, focus on alignment with competency rather than extended definition. Extended definition is intended to provide examples of some (but not all) ways to achieve the outcome. It is not intended to dictate exactly how the outcome would be achieved. If the outcome is chosen, it is expected that the course would “contribute to” achievement of the outcome, but not necessarily align with every aspect of the extended definition.
* It is expected that for every course, faculty will choose at least one competency as integral. It is likely (but not required) that faculty will designate at least one competency as supplemental. There is no limit to how many integral and supplemental competencies are chosen.
* An explanation of “program mapping” may be beneficial. Also, an example of a matrix as a visual demonstration may help to clarify the next phase of the process.

The committee discussed the current timeline for completion. The timeline continues to be a suggested guideline. There are suggested benchmarks along the way and the committee will make modifications as needed. Departments are asked to submit syllabi by the May deadline so that a program map may be created to inform the next stage of the process. In some cases, departments may only be able to submit syllabi for high impact courses, or courses that they are able to complete as they work in sequence. Eileen encouraged members to work towards the May goal, but to only submit syllabi that they feel are complete and properly vetted. A preliminary map can still be developed if some syllabi are not completed.