1. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, R. Craig Schnell reviewed the charge for the Committee and noted that this very important process will probably take at least two years. Ideally the Committee will bring forth proposals that focus on student learning outcomes, create an integrated assessment for student learning, are intellectually exciting, and generate some campus controversy when they are discussed and adopted. Higher education is changing rapidly because of online courses and the for-profit “universities.” We need to address those changes.

2. Larry began what he called an “Overview of the UCRC Journey” by introducing the co-chair required by the Senate, Marion Harris. He noted that for him, the key phrase from the letter of charge was that our work should be “transparent, inclusive, student-focused, faculty-driven, NDSU specific.” It’s the “kiss of death” in this process to find a great general education program and just try to import it to your own campus. Whatever we do needs to fit with NDSU culture. Larry thinks of the Committee as the “Dream Team,” chosen because they are very well respected on campus, and because they represent a blend of people who have toiled in the fields of general education for many years and of people who can come to the table with fresh eyes and fresh questions. We all have multiple roles and responsibilities in this effort. On one hand, committee members were chosen to represent particular campus interests. Faculty, for example, are disciplinary experts, scholars who can’t leave our training behind us. That’s who we are. On the other hand, members were also chosen because they were seen as university citizens who would consider what was best for all of our students, not just for those in their department or college. Larry continued with what he saw as tasks we will face: educating ourselves about national trends and about local data; perhaps generating new information; raising campus awareness about our work; being receptive to ideas and insights from the campus; and being VERY mindful of campus culture. He argued that one of our most important undertakings was to develop a sense of trust among ourselves and to encourage the campus to trust that we were focusing on what is best for student learning and were not going to impose a grand solution on the campus.

3. Larry suggested that a likely timeline and activities for Committee members to spend our first year gathering information and deciding on procedures. He hoped that in Fall Semester 2011 we would be able to bring several models to campus and that the Faculty Senate would vote on one in Spring 2012. People who have been through this process tell us it is a political process—shoe leather and face time.
4. The UCRC Blackboard is up with the main points from the Provost’s charge in the announcements and folders with basic background readings nationally and locally in the Content section.

5. After Committee members introduced themselves, Larry distributed two items of background reading from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU): Paul Gaston and Jerry Gaff, *Revising General Education—and Avoiding the Potholes*; and *Taking Responsibility for the Quality of the Undergraduate Degree*.

6. Brock asked about the point of revising general education. Kevin noted that we need to begin by asking what knowledge and skills do we want all of our graduates to have. That's why this is curriculum review, because we will be thinking about the entire undergraduate experience: general education, the major, and the co-curriculum.

7. Committee members were in favor of trying to schedule a four hour retreat this semester. Larry will set up a Doodle.

8. Committee members discussed how we should make decisions. There was a consensus that a simple majority was fine for internal procedures, but that a “super-majority” of two-thirds would be good for major decisions on models. The Committee also discussed the advantages and disadvantages of anonymous voting. Lisa suggested we might use the GDC as a way to discuss models anonymously. We left the possibility of anonymous voting open.

9. The Committee concluded by discussing the actual process and our relationship to the Faculty Senate. The NDSU team that went to the AACU General Education Institute in 2009 met with all of the deans when they returned and learned they all supported reviewing and revising general education. That is quite different than the previous revisions in 1991 when some deans were strongly opposed to any changes. We are charged with proposing appropriate revisions to the Senate. They make the “final” decision, although President Bresciani must approve it. It will be good for us to have the support of the Student Senate and other groups, but the Faculty Senate has the power. Some smaller campuses have followed a process in which the proposed models all came from the campus at large and were then selected by votes of the entire faculty.

10. The meeting adjourned at 12:55 pm.

Our next meeting will be scheduled soon.

Minutes submitted by Marion Harris and Larry Peterson