Meeting called to order at 9:20am.

1. Minutes of the Jan 30, 2013 meeting

Motion to approve minutes as written. Motion seconded.

Motion carried.

2. Announcements

- None at this time

3. Subcommittee Reports

CA2
- Not available at this time

CA3 Science and Technology
- Not available at this time

CA4
- Not available at this time

W
The committee recommends approving the following new course proposal:
- EVST 4000W/Environmental Studies Capstone Research Project

Points of Review
- New major that now exists; this is the capstone project required as the last step
- The course meets twice a week; students complete their capstone projects in seminar context
- Major appears to be housed under Economics department

Discussion:
- T. Abbott questioned if an honors student could use this as their thesis; the answer is Yes – Will get Honors credit, W credit and Thesis credit.

The committee also recommends approving the following course revision proposals:
- ECE 2001 Electrical Circuits
- ECE 2001W Electrical Circuits

Point of Review
- Course had been put on hold while E. Schultz checked into the separation of the W; was deemed to be acceptable

Motion to approve the recommendations of the W Subcommittee. Motion seconded.

Motion carried.

4. Reports and Discussion

- M. Sewall reported that he has a meeting with Sally Reis to request same amount of funding for this coming FY and as this past year. He will suggest that the Provost’s Competition be put on a two-year cycle, beginning in the Fall 2013; he will also propose to do the W-assessment for the 1-credit Ws in Summer 2014
• T. Abbott asked for clarification as to whether the Provost’s Competition is specifically for the creation of new courses or whether it is legitimate to use the funds to upgrade an existing course and when, if at all, this is the responsibility of the course’s department itself. He suggested an update to the request for proposal language that would be very specific about what is expected of potential proposals.
• A. Perez noted that the competition was originally designed for the creation of new courses but transitioned to one that included grants for the revision of existing courses with the goal of enhancing gen ed.
• M. Sewall clarified that the objective of the competition is simply to “improve the quality of general education.”
• It was noted that T. Abbott’s PC-winning course was a huge success; the suggestion was made to use this as an example for PR purposes when competition is announced; assemble 2-3 vignettes
• It was agreed that the PC does not need to emphasize “multiple program content areas” in the next round of proposals
• T. Abbott agreed to serve on the next PC review committee
• There was some discussion of how the governor’s new STEM initiative will affect gen ed
• T. Deans suggested that some basic gen ed courses may need to be realigned based on shifts in enrollment patterns
• There was general discussion of the ideas that departments may need to look at the gen ed requirements for majors across the university and update them

Meeting adjourned at 10:23am.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
GEOC Program Assistant