Liaisons were chosen for certain areas of the general education curriculum. The expectation is that the liaison will think from this perspective in discussions in addition to representing their school. They will also serve as a primary point of contact.

First Year Experience - Fiona
Sophomore seminar – Betsy
Common read – Nancy
Capstone – Sascha

Common Read:

The council agreed that we will use the current common read at least for a second year, this has many benefits but chief among them is letting us focus on making sure the course is structured and focused appropriately. It’s also possible to have a “signature book” that never changes or changes very infrequently.

Regardless of an ultimate decision on how often the book changes we should try to get the common read thought of on campus as anchored in the seminar, but ideally be used in other courses as well. Let’s use this first round of seminars as our test to ensure the book works, but then focus group and follow up to build broader engagement.

Sophomore Seminar:

There is a problem with funding things for the seminar and it would be helpful to have a budget. It’s difficult to encourage the use of innovative or high impact practices, let alone community events without institutional support.

The museum project for the course, despite being explained as a requirement, has less than full participation. This is a problem we need to follow up on as currently it is the only way that sections of the course will interact. It would also be good to have the museum have a blog, that would encourage students to interact with each other across sections beyond just a single point near the conclusion of the course.

Some problems with the seminar pilot may be in part because of how it was sold to faculty, which tended to emphasize opportunities to customize the course. However there is also a problem with advising. Anecdotally some students are not being tracked appropriately.

To try and get some more detailed feedback college representatives should talk to the instructors from the seminar, to get anecdotes feedback, etc. **BY THE NEXT MEETING**

- Would you let us know if you are doing these requirements, museum and the writing assignment sakai, syllabus... why not?
- General feedback about how the course is going
Beyond informal feedback we should schedule a formal check-in with as many instructors as possible. Also we need to have faculty teaching it in the spring get socialized to the course. We will schedule a workshop for the spring instructors, at which we should emphasize very clear expectations to ensure that all faculty are aware of requirements.

**Approval of New Math Course:**

The course was approved with minor revisions, the approval of this course will mandate advising changes which Daniel is making sure the schools are aware of.

There was some discussion of potential changes to the approval process for new courses. There should be a feedback mechanism for new courses after some initial offerings, Catherine will coordinate. Perhaps there should also be an assessment back or assignment bank.

Column 2 in the current form, which asks for more detailed information about how learning will be assessed, reads more like guidelines than a requirement. Nancy and Catherine will investigate other certification programs to see how other schools manage this process.

**Recertification:**

There was a great deal of discussion about a timeline for recertification. The final result was an agreement that a whole cycle should be completed every 5 years. However before getting started we need to see a general overview of courses. We can then map learning objectives and spot gaps. Recertification will probably be done domain areas. Dates for possible work over the summer will be discussed next meeting.

**Case studies:**

Fiona, Mike, and Allen presented on the colleges whose General Education Programs they had examined and the meeting concluded.