1. The minutes from 12/10/13 emailed on 12/10/13 (with corrected date and room) were approved.

2. Larry, Amy, and Kent reported on their funding meeting with the Provost.
   - The Provost offered no additional funds. He suggested a 2 for 1 funding option. If colleges or departments are willing to “retire” an existing GE course to free up 1 FTE, then the Provost suggested an additional FTE could be approved for that college or department to help teach the courses that are being presented in the new GE model. It would be important to have a “hold harmless” commitment to not damage any department. Because the funds for the additional FTEs would need to come from the “true up” funds, the support of the deans, the president, and the new provost is necessary.
   - Based on their meeting with the Provost, they recommended a four step plan, emphasizing communication with the deans and other “opinion leaders.” The Provost believes that by doing this, we will be more likely to get the support of key administrators on campus and funding.
     ✓ Create a model which meets the priorities for improved student learning from our surveys and campus meetings.
     ✓ Determine what the costs would be associated with that model (how many people would it take to develop and implement, etc.).
     ✓ Develop a clear set of “talking points” on the benefits achieved and problems solved.
     ✓ Consult with the Deans (perhaps individually) to get them on board.
     ✓ Consult with other key people on campus to get their support and feedback.
   - Larry, Kent, and Amy suggested postponing the open forums for now until we complete the four point plan and have strong support for the model.
   - Larry suggested having two phases to complete the four points.
     ✓ Phase One: Model Completion. Develop the model and determine the accompanying costs.
     ✓ Phase Two: Community Organizing. Consult with the Deans, first, then have one-on-one conversations with faculty, chairs, and students who are “opinion leaders.”
   - Larry said it’s possible some committee members may want to be part of only one phase rather than the whole plan.

3. We discussed the report from Kent, Amy, and Larry as follows:
   - Cynthia asked how long this four step plan could take. Larry said the Provost indicated it could take up to a year. Larry thinks since we have made some good progress already, that it’s possible to have the first phase done by the end of the year or even possibly the middle of next semester.
   - Andy asked if there are other things that were discussed during the funding meeting with the Provost that might hinder the process—such as the consequences of the so-called
“Pathways to Student Success” model from former NDUS Chancellor Shirvani. Larry, Amy and Kent didn’t recall anything.

- Larry noted that the Provost said that GE should be part of a plan that goes beyond any particular President or Provost. It shouldn’t matter who holds those seats, although we need their support.
- Members asked about how our working model will fit with the NDUS General Education policy. Cole said he’s been in touch with Lisa Johnson about our work and will be presenting our model to her in the future to get feedback from her and make sure it’s in compliance with GERTA.
- Because one justification for existing GE courses is that they attract majors, Andy asked if we could actually get evidence for how many students changed majors after taking one of the basic GE courses with lots of students. Larry thought Bill Slanger’s office would be able to gather that data for the committee.
- Carolyn asked about the implications for common course numbering if some GE courses are retired and new ones are created. Cole said he didn’t think it would be an issue.
- Kent asked if there were any examples of universities that offered critical thinking courses that took hold and succeeded. Larry said Maryland offered I-Courses and he thought some other institutions did, such as Boise State and University of Nevada, Las Vegas.
- Kent suggested having evidence of other models that incorporated critical thinking components and worked would help reduce anxiety and allow us to gain support from the campus. RaNelle thinks we should complete our model and then go search for one that resembles it to use as evidence.
- Lisa suggested finalizing the model, but concurrently lobbying the key backers (president, vice president for finance, deans, faculty, etc.).

4. Seth emailed Larry and indicated he still has not been able to connect with Rhonda Magel about math-based critical reasoning.

5. Cole passed out two handouts on transfer student data.

- The first handout showed transfer students and first year students who transferred in credits by college for terms 1210 thru 1330. The second handout showed the number of GE credits those students brought in and how many of those students had their GE waived. Only 11.5% of the transfer students and 0.3% of the first year students have their GE requirements waived, which means almost 90% of students will need to follow any new GE model.
- RaNelle asked how many students transfer in with an Associate’s degree in Applied Science because they are still required to take GE courses at NDSU to meet the 36 credit minimum.
- Larry asked for an electronic copy from Cole so he can share this data with Bill Slanger.

6. Kent asked what our next steps should be.

- Larry suggested looking again at the models from other institutions we examined in detail (Nevada – Reno, Maryland-College Park, Nebraska-Lincoln) to see if there are any characteristics we should have in our model.
7. The next meeting was scheduled for January 7. Because there will be a number of committee members gone, we will cancel that meeting. Our next meeting will be on January 14th and we will discuss the model and what components we need to discuss and finalize.

Next meeting, Tuesday, January 14th at 9 am in Peace Garden