Call to Order

Ford called meeting to order at 12:45

Open Discussion

The first 15 minutes included an open discussion of the roles and procedures for this new Gen Ed Com (GEC). The Task Force’s report was referred to on several occasions to clarify GEC’s relationship to the Curriculum Committee and the larger process of getting courses accepted. Some particulars were discussed:

- Legitimacy of an upper-level Cell Biology course as gen ed option.
- Place of International Economics Issues and Policies (ECON 3003) as a Global Studies option.
- Place of Honors Classes in gen ed structure.

Questions were also raised about how far the GEC could drill down into course content (such as textbook choices) to insure that content matched the gen ed expectations for achieving stated gen ed goals. It was agreed that these issues can be handled in individual schools or departments.

Elections

Discussion:

- Election of Chair
- Election of Secretary

Action:

- Nominations taken. Ford nominated, accepted, and elected unanimously.
- Nomination taken. Ulbrich volunteered and elected unanimously.

Discussion

Discussion:

- Suggestion to invite Dr. Millikin and Dr. Housel to meetings as needed as guest

Action:

- Agreement

New Business

- Determine which of 5 areas and which requirements (i.e. disciplines) should be evaluated on 5 year rotation.
- All members should become familiar with the Task Force Report.
- Determine GEC’s role in HLC visit.
Call to Order

GEC Chair outlined some GEC future activities based on the Task Force Report, and based on the coming needs in the curriculum. The new addition of HONS 1213 and 1313 to the General Education Reqs will be the first activity. One of the 5 Gen Ed Areas needs to be chosen for evaluation in 2014-15.

Old Business

Discussion: Min Soe has class and labs during the GEC’s meeting time in Fall 2014. He is possibly going to find a replacement to represent his Dept.

Action: None

New Business

1. Discussion: The Request for Program Modification (Form 7) has been submitted by Honors director as the first case for the GEC to evaluate and decide. The request seeks to establish HONS 1213 and 1313 “Honors Literature and Rhetoric I and II” as equivalencies for ENGL 1113H and 1213H in fulfillment of the Gen Ed Req for 2 comp courses. Rationale is explained on Form 7. The “trick” will be to make this a one-way equivalency – fulfil req for Comp I and II AND replace those, but not vice versa.

Action: GEC agreed to evaluate the Honors Proposal for next meeting once the process evaluation is established.

2. Discussion: Need for GEC forms to add and/or drop courses from Gen Ed reqs. Adapting the Curriculum Committee form to GEC needs is more practical. Thus, the GEC form will be different from Curriculum Committee form.

Action: Concurrence by all present, but no formal vote.

3. Discussion: Question of whether Form 8 should be inserted as part of the Gen Ed course addition form. Possible distinctions b/w RSU specific forms and OHRE forms.

Action: Open discussion.

4. Discussion: Motion to change Question #3 and #7 of GEC Course Proposal Form (Appendix 5 in the Task Force packet) Proposed changes in bold:
   - #3 “Using Bloom’s Taxonomy, list the student learning outcomes.”
   - #7 “Which General Education Outcome does this course serve...”
   - Column A under #7: “G.E. Outcomes”

Action: Moved by D. Ulbrich. Seconded by K. Woller. Vote: passed by unanimous vote.

5. Discussion: Motion to make addition to Question #1; to renumber Question #5 into Question #6; and to add a new Question #5 on GEC Course Proposal Form. Discussions followed on the wordings and requirements. Proposed changes in bold:
   - #1 …. Submittal to the General Education Committee (include that documentation).
   - #5 renumbered at #6.
   - New #5 to read: “Which General Education requirement is this course intended to fulfill?”


6. Discussion: Which of 5 Gen Ed Areas should be evaluated in 2014-15. Either the area with the most courses (Global Studies), or the area with the fewest courses (Communication). Logic for choosing Communication is that 3 courses will allow the GEC to work out the procedures for evaluation with a smaller set of courses. Further discussion on 2 questions the PROCESS of Area and/or course evaluation:
What is the GEC matrix for evaluating Areas and courses?
Is GEC going to utilize Assessment data?
Suggestion made that GEC members look at “Leap Program” at www.aacu.org to find “Value Rubrics”

Action: Open discussion. General agreement that Communication should be evaluated in 2014-15, but no formal vote.

Next Meeting

Discussion:
- Set to be on Mondays, 22 September and 6 October at 1:30pm in BH 124.
- Evaluate Honors 1213 and 1313
- Need to create a form for “Remove class from Gen Ed Core”
- Determine which of 5 Gen Ed areas should be evaluated in 2014-15
- Need for a substitute Secretary for D. Ulbrich b/c he needs to teach beginning at 2pm.

Action: Summary by GEC Chair
Call to Order

GEC Chair stated the MPS is still looking for a replacement for Min Soe.

Approval of Minutes: Spelling change to Prof. Zimmermann’s name. Minutes for 8 September 2014 approved with this one minor revision.

Old Business

1. **Discussion**: Questions and discussions about approving HONS 1213 and 1313 as one-way substitutes for ENGL 1113H and ENGL 1213H respectively.
   - What assessment, if at all, is appropriate for Honors courses in general and for the propose HONS 1213 and 1313? Should any Honors courses be included in the assessment of the non-Honors courses?
   - EH currently assesses ENGL 1113H and 1213H as part of the Comp I and Comp II pool. HPS did not require submitted data for 2483H in Spring 2014. Other departments assess Honors courses as part of entire pool.
   - Discussion followed about whether the Honors courses (with greater expectations) do not skew the data in the large pool of Gen Ed courses. It is understood that the minimum performance requirements (Question 8 “Objectives” on new GEC Course Proposal Form) are the same for Gen Ed and Honor courses. However, individual Honors instructors will add requirements, so it is not clear whether the Honors and non-Honors course are truly equivalent for assessment purposes.
   - HONS 1213 and 1313 retain the minimal requirements of Comp I and Comp II. See Q8 on GEC Course Proposal Form.
   - Uncertainty about how far the GEC can evaluate course performance expectations already approved by the Curriculum Committee. General agreement that this is best handled by specific department faculty.
   - Motion to approve the GEC proposals for HONS 1213 and 1313, as submitted by J.Ford, and with the recommendation that the EH Faculty revisit the specific HONS 1213 and 1313 performance expectations relative to minimum expectations set for Comp I and II. See Q8 on GEC Course Proposal Form.
   - After GEC approval, proposed courses will go to Academic Council.
   **Action**: Moved by D. Ulbrich. Seconded by K. Woller. Vote: passed by unanimous vote.

2. **Discussion**: There is need for a new Course Approval Box on the History Form.
   **Action**: Limited discussion.

3. **Discussion**: There is a need for a “Drop course from Gen Ed” form. This new GEC form should include components and/or answer questions:
   - Does the faculty wanting the deletion need to do a cross-history?
   - Is there a new course replacing the deleted course?
   - What is the rationale for deleting the course?
   - What is the effect of the deleted course on teaching rotations and personnel? (This branched off into 2 other discussion – see 4 and 5 below)
   - There was general agreement the Curriculum Committee’s “Delete Course Form” should be revised/adapted for GEC needs.
   **Action**: J. Ford agreed to draft the “Drop course from Gen Ed” form for next meeting.

4. **Discussion**: Questions posed:
   - Is there an existing policy on how often Gen Ed courses will be offered?
   - Does GEC want to construct GEC policies and procedures for rotation of Gen Ed course?
   - What if a course changes from Gen Ed Area to another Area?
   - How should this be handled?
Action: Some discussion, but no firm decisions. Tabled for future.

New Business

- Circulation and discussion of draft “Drop course from Gen Ed” form.
- How to assess Gen Ed courses?
- How and why, if at all, to evaluation course content of Gen Ed courses?

Next Meeting: 6 October 2014 at 1:30 in BH 124
Call to Order

GEC Chair began meeting with focus on Assessment that could be addressed to S. Housel.

Approval of Minutes: Minor change to add the word Box and History Form to Item 2. Minutes of 6 October 2014 approved with these minor revisions.

Old Business

1. **Discussion:** In meeting of 22 September, questions about the relationships between Assessment Committee and GEC were raised. So, S. Housel (chair of UAC) attended meeting on 6 October.
   - Should Gen Ed courses get more emphasis and weight in assessment? Should GEC engage in its own assessment?
   - Positive: Attention specifically on courses in Gen Ed
   - Negative: Too many meetings with departments.
   - No easy solution: Either GEC is outside the assessment process, or the UAC splits assessment with GEC.

Other considerations and ideas:
- Not practical to do GEC assessment via email.
- How to separate issues of determining the validity of the GEC in areas like assessment and like comprehensive Gen Ed area evaluation (which GEC is charged with doing).
- Face to face, not via email.
- Not enough time in UAC meeting as is.
- Not all GEC members would need to attend UAC meetings –create a 3-peson team to spread the responsibility
- GEC should be setting Ged Ed-related goals and assessing goals (not necessarily same at UAC).

Possible Solutions:
- GEC conduct same kind of assessment process as UAC
- UAC continues to assess and then send results to GEC to filter through Gen Ed objectives.
- Amend SLOs to get relevant info relating to Gen Ed to GEC for specific assessment.
- GEC could attend UAC dept assessment meetings and get distinct time on agenda to query Depts about Gen Ed topics.

**Action:** Open discussion with input from S. Housel and other members or former members of UAC.

2. **Discussion:** Which should be included in GEC discussion, assessment, and/or evaluation? Should “free elective” be included?

**Action:** Ongoing discussion

3. **Discussion:** Revised “Gen Ed Course Removal” Form presented for discussion and vote. Motion to approve this Form with the two minor changes:
   - In Question #2, insert (i.e. global studies, physical sciences, etc.) between words requirement and does.
   - In Question #6, delete Objectives and replace with Learning Outcomes.

**Action:** Moved by L. Gray. Seconded by C. Zimmermann. Passed by unanimous vote.

4. **Discussion:** For GEC’s future reference: Academic Council to add a form and to post the web site. Both approved HONS 1213 and 1313 are on AC’s agenda.
1. **Discussion:** Continue to think about how GEC and UAC should coordinate and cooperate in assessment.  
**Action:** Ongoing discussion

2. **Discussion:** Gen Ed course rotations. When was last time Gen Ed courses were offered? How many sections? According to Dr. Beck courses exist until removed or reworded, no definite shelf life. Suggestion that course rotations and recent offerings of Gen Ed courses should be reviewed with Dept Heads.  
**Action:** Ongoing discussion

3. **Discussion:** Motion to request that M. Millikin run statistics on what courses are primarily taken as the “free elective” and to run stats on general education course rotations and recent offerings. How many sections of each Gen Ed, how often, and how recent? (This can be done after HLC is completed due to excess workload of M. Millikin).  
**Action:** Moved by K. Woller. Passed by unanimous vote.

4. **Discussion:** Misc. Announcements for next meeting in November. Read books on Gen Ed and await feedback form from UAC. Access to UAC reports will be available through Hillcat Hub.

**Next Meeting:** 3 November 2014 at 1:30 in BH-124
Call to Order

GEC Chair.

Approval of Minutes: Minor revisions to Minutes. Minutes of 6 October 2014 approved with minor revisions.

Old Business

1. Discussion:
   - There was talk of streamlining some of the courses in “Global Studies,” but then there were questions and discussions about what ripple effect this streamlining would have on other courses in “Global Studies” and other areas.
   - There were also questions about how enrollments in some GEC courses may drive department course offerings and even personnel/course rotations across departments.
   - This would need to be addressed in the future by other committee, Dept chairs, and Deans, as well as GEC.
   - Unsure that we could find what the choices of “free elective” for each student. Too many variables.
   - Uncertain what criteria students use to choose their free electives.
   - A couple of patterns are clear. Students don’t pick math or science as their free elective; and they tend to pick Intro Psych or Intro to Soc.
   - There was discussion about CS1113 and how it once fit and now fits into the Gen Ed. But, no resolutions.
   - Enrollment data was requested but the variables make collection and analysis difficult. Due to HLC meetings in mid-November, there was no time to gather data or analyze it in November/December. The GEC requested that M. Millikin try to provide data in sometime in Spring 2015.

   **Action:** Open discussion with input from S. Housel and M. Millikin.

New Business

1. Discussion:
   - Gen Ed’s role/place in Assessment relative to UAC.
   - Gen Ed SLR completed. Gen Ed Formal Review should be conducted in the Spring and presented as part of assessment next year.
   - Dept Chairs will fill out surveys, but who is responsible for Gen Ed activities/components? UAC or GEC or both?
   - S. Housel and GEC concurred that GEC would do face-to-face with Departments involved in Gen Ed.
   - The UAC agreed the GEC should have primary responsibility for Gen Ed assessment this year on a trial basis. (NOTE: No minutes from UAC meeting on 10 October 2014, and thus NO formal, specific mandate is available.)
   - However, given that mid-year is not necessarily best time for GEC’s integration in the Assessment process. Questions arose: Shouldn’t the UAC examine Gen Ed SLR this academic year? And then GEC would assume that role next academic year?

   **Action:** Ongoing discussion with M. Millikin.

2. Discussion:
   - Additional factors regarding GEC and Assessment -- both the coming HLC meetings and the ongoing role of GEC in assessment relative to UAC.
   - Many questions arose about what GEC role and the means of assessment would look like.
     - How do we bring all the moving parts together? Some Depts have 1 or 2 GEC courses, and others have several.
     - Should faculty representatives from Areas (i.e. Global Studies) be brought into discuss assessment?
• Or should Gen Ed Learning Outcomes (i.e. Critical Thinking)?
  • Or should individual departments be brought in?

• It was pointed out that some GEC courses might cover multiple areas (i.e. “critical thinking” and “values”), so should these respective faculty attend more assessment meetings?

• A suggestion was made to create a grid/graph with 4 areas and 5 groups included, and with each Gen Ed course plugged into the grid. This would allow GEC to track not only individual courses' fulfillment of Gen Ed SLRs and Outcomes, but also the entire picture.

• UAC approved community-wide meetings/public forums for assessment of GEC. But again, there was not really a clear mandate from UAC about what those meetings would look like.

• Thereafter many practical and programmatic questions arose:
  • How will the peer review process work? Combined with UAC or parallel to UAC.
  • What should GEC’s evaluation process/form look like? Round tables, formal agendas, breakout sessions?
  • What data should be collected?

• If surveys of faculty and students are used, what should they look like? I.e.:
  • “Have you seen the outcomes?”
  • “Does your course fulfill one or more outcomes?”
  • “Do you understand where/how your course fits into the groups and the areas?”
  • “What ideas do you have to grow/improve Gen Ed program?”
  • Should the GEC report on these surveys come before OR after the public forums?
  • How do we inform faculty how to teach Gen Ed courses?
  • How does GEC determine and communicate best practices across diverse groups and areas with multiple departments?

  Action: Ongoing discussion

Next Meeting: Awaiting new semester schedule in Spring 2015. As of compilation of these minutes, the meeting will be Monday 2 February at 2pm.
Call to Order

GEC Chair began meeting overview: Review HLC visit and report, determine best content for a Public Forum on Gen Ed.

Approval of Minutes: Minor changes to 2 February 2014 minutes. Minutes of 6 October 2014 approved with these minor revisions.

Old Business

1. Discussion: Relevant sections of HLC’s draft “Report of a Comprehensive Evaluation Visit”.
   RSU Gen Ed does well at:
   - p. 5 Tying the Gen Ed Areas and Learning Outcomes to RSU Mission
   - p. 17 RSU Gen Ed provides appropriate higher education intellectual inquiry, and learning support.
   - p. 17 RSU Gen Ed exceeding program of many other institutions
   RSU Gen Ed needs work on:
   - p. 5 Gen Ed mission and purpose needs to be explained and understood by faculty, advisors, and students.
   - p. 18 Adjuncts need to understand Gen Ed vision and be held accountable.
   - p. 25 Identify process and relationship among UAC, DLC, and GEC regarding Ged Ed assessment
   Action: Open discussion with input from S. Housel and M. Millikin.

2. Discussion: HLC Report was non-prescriptive, and committee should be formed for the next accreditation cycle.
   Action: Brief discussion and no committee was appointed.

New Business

1. Discussion: Unanimous agreement that a “PUBLIC FORUM” on Gen Ed needed to be held for all faculty and advisors at RSU -- to publicize the purposes of Gen Ed. Several questions and issues arose:
   - Need to review results of ETS and course assessment
   - Need to ensure clearly worded explanation of Gen Ed is imbedded in the bulletins and other RSU literature
   - Need to establish procedures and measures/assessments to ensure that Adjuncts know Gen Ed objectives and implement those objectives
   - Need to establish standards and rubrics for evaluating/assessing effectiveness of individual Gen Ed courses and the entire Gen Ed process.
   - GEC needs to do homework to ensure that the faculty’s needs will be known/satisfied by the Forum.
   Result: GEC agreed that a SURVEY was needed to best determine faculty needs and questions to be addressed. The Public Forum will be held later in the Spring semester.
   Action: Open discussion with input from S. Housel and M. Millikin.

2. Discussion: Observations and sample questions to be included in the SURVEY and considered for the Public Forum:
   - Need to avoid overloading the Survey and the Forum with too many parts
   - Stress that RSU possesses an effective Gen Ed program, but too few faculty, advisors, and students understand why and how it works.
   - Stress that the GEC is not trying to fix the Gen Ed program, rather to make it more coherent and effective.
   - Balance micro-level of individual course components with macro-level of Areas and Gen Ed Learning Outcomes.
   - Should there be a Survey question about the “New Strategic Plan”? If yes, then this question must be meaningful.
Survey must be distributed to adjuncts, but should their surveys be handled distinctly?
Survey and Forum to follow should be seen as positives – helping faculty and advisors do their jobs.

Action: Open discussion with input from S. Housel and M. Millikin. J. Evusa and M. Millikin agreed to create a draft SURVEY by the 17 February meeting.

3. Discussion: Timetables:
   - Survey drafted by 3 February.
   - Survey distributed in early March
   - Survey data analyzed in late March
   - Public Forum mid-April possibly on Thursday or Friday afternoon

Action: Chair proposed timetables, and GEC concurred. D. Ulbrich volunteered to work on the Public Forum presentation once the needs are determined from analysis of the Survey.

4. Discussion: Should the GEC address upper-division courses that fulfill/teach Gen Ed Learning Outcomes? It was suggested the upper division courses be set aside until the existing Gen Ed courses are sufficiently evaluated. No consensus and no vote occurred.

Action: Ongoing discussion. To be revisited in the future.

Next Meeting: 17 February at 2:00 in BH-101
Call to Order

The GEC Chair opened the meeting by briefly setting a 2-point agenda:

- Examination of the Gen Ed draft survey for faculty as prepared by M. Millikin and J. Evusa.
- Should the GEC (and/or UAC) have a voice on the next self-study committee for the next accreditation cycle?

Approval of Minutes: Minor changes to 2 February 2015 minutes. Approved with these minor revisions.

Old Business

1. **Discussion:** Overall, the GEC found the draft Gen Ed Survey (created by J. Evusa and M. Millikin) to have strong content, including informative questions, and containing useful quantitative and qualitative data that can be analyzed. The GEC then evaluated and offered suggestions for revision to the draft Gen Ed Survey.
   
   **Action:** The GEC complemented and thanked M. Millikin and J. Evusa for their work on the draft Survey.

2. **Discussion:** Other issues regarding Gen Ed:
   - The GEC needs to educate and market Gen Ed. There is not necessarily an understanding of what Gen Ed is and what courses are included. The GEC must emphasize that Gen Ed is the basis and foundation for the entire university education.
   - The GEC should acquire assessment data for all courses (including Science courses not listed in assessment).
   - The Chair wanted to get the Survey data back and analyzed, allowing the GEC to give guidance and suggestions to the departments regarding their roles in Gen Ed. Global Studies will be particularly challenging because of the large number of diverse course offerings from so many disciplines
   
   **Action:** Open discussion with input from S. Housel and M. Millikin.

3. **Discussion:** Several additional questions or revised questions on the Gen Ed Survey were suggested:
   - Question 10 had some overlapping courses that need to be deleted (such as Music Appreciation) because of duplicate listings.
   - Question 10 should be sub-divided into the “Humanities,” “Global Studies,” etc., rather than alphabetically listed.
   - Question 11 should possibly ask faculty if they think a two-level course should be developed for beginners and advanced.
   - Question 11 should have the two economics courses deleted.
   - Add a question about whether the Gen Ed courses (41 credit hours) should be completed in the first 60 credit hours of coursework (as-is), or if this threshold should be increased to the first 70 credit hours.

   **Action:** M. Millikin also took notes to make revisions to the Gen Ed survey.

New Business

1. **Discussion:** Should the GEC (and/or UAC) have a voice on the next self-study committee for the next accreditation cycle? Yes, because these committees provide assessment for all programs, departments, and courses at RSU (UAC); and oversight of the Gen Ed courses (GEC). This means that both committees are stake holders in the self-study process.
   
   **Action:** Open discussion with input from S. Housel (as UAC Chair) and M. Millikin. GEC members concurred that the GEC and UAC should have members/input into next self-study committee for the next accreditation cycle. No assignments of personnel were made. Both M. Millikin and S. Housel concurred with this course of action.
2. **Discussion:** How can the GEC evaluate Gen Ed competency skills acquired by students in their Gen Ed courses proper, as well as applied through their upper-division specialized courses? The ETS is used at present time, and the GEC also considered using the Senior Capstones as another measure.  
   **Action:** Open discussion regarding Gen Ed competency skills, but no concrete decisions or motions were made. This will be revisited in the future after the Survey is distributed and the Forum is completed.

3. **Discussion:** Suggestion that any questionable Gen Ed courses be re-evaluated to determine if they actually fulfill some or all of the Gen Ed Learning Outcomes.  
   **Action:** Open discussion occurred but no concrete decisions or motions were made. This will be revisited in the future.

4. **Discussion:** Timetable for the rest of Spring semester:  
   - Complete the Gen Ed Survey and circulate to faculty before Spring Break.  
   - Collect and analyze data soon after Spring Break so that the 6 April meeting can focus on creating the presentation and content of the Forum.  
   - Forum tentatively scheduled for the late afternoon of Thursday 23 April or Friday 24 April or Friday 1 May. The GEC Chair agreed to look into possibilities.  
   **Action:** Open discussion and concurrence with this timetable. If the Forum can avoid being scheduled on 1 May (last day of classes), then that would be preferable.

5. **Discussion:** GEC Chair proposed that the GEC circulate and evaluate future drafts of the Gen Ed faculty survey via email attachments, and then approve the survey so that it can be circulated in March.  
   **Action:** GEC concurred with the Chair’s proposal. Then M. Millikin agreed to make proposed changes to the survey and circulate for comments and approval via email in 2 weeks following the 23 Feb meeting.

**Next Meeting:** 6 April at 2:00 in BH-101  
**Adjournment:** Motion to adjourn 3:07 - Moved. Seconded. Passed unanimously.
Call to Order

The GEC Chair opened the meeting and focused primarily on Gen Ed Survey results and on organizing the content for the Gen Ed Forum.

Approval of Minutes: 26 February 2015 minutes Minutes of 26 Feb 2015 approved with no revisions.

Old Business

1. **Discussion:** Several questions and themes regarding the Gen Ed Survey were covered. In particular, there appeared to be a discrepancy on the wordings and/or data for questions dealing with whether courses should or should not remain in Gen Ed.
   **Action:** M. Millikin will pull the data to clarify findings on these questions.

2. **Discussion:** S. Housel raised the question of how and what Assessment data would be collected for Gen Ed? Would it be an independent collection by Gen Ed? OR combined with/drawn from UAC assessment data?
   **Action:** This was tabled for future consideration.

New Business

1. **Discussion:** The Gen Ed Forum will take place on Friday 1 May in the Performance Studio at 1-2:15 (to be followed by the Faculty Association meeting at 2:30-4). This makes sense because it will not mean a separate time or meeting requirement for faculty members to attend both functions.
   **Action:** Concurrence by all committee members and by guests.

2. **Discussion:** A Read-Ahead Packet will be circulated to all faculty members on/about Monday 20 April. This will include up to five full pages (with one page for each item) to be compiled by designated committee members or guests:
   - Gen Ed Task Force Summary – K. Woller
   - GEC work to date – D. Ulbrich
   - Gen Ed Assessment Results – S. Housel
   - ETS Results Summary – M. Millikin
   - Gen Ed Survey Result Summary – J. Evusa – suggest focusing on several key questions or groups of questions.
   - HLC Results Summary – C. Zimmermann and D. Ulbrich (ideally to be folded into GEC work to date summary)
   - L. Gray will collate.
   - Due date for drafts will be 13 April via email to all GEC members and guests. Finalized packed will be approved on 20 April at the GEC meeting.
   **Action:** Open discussion and concurrence by committee member and guests. Assignments made.

3. **Discussion:** The format/agenda of the Gen Ed Forum:
   - Need to allow faculty members maximum time to discuss and ask questions about Gen Ed program and process, so as to get buy-in from faculty members as stakeholders in Gen Ed.
   - One moderator running the forum and all committee members sitting on stage.
   - Very brief introduction of topics and mission at the Forum
   - Each committee member assigned to compile each piece of Read-Ahead Packet will serve as initial respondent in discussion. Other committee members will add commentary as needed.
   - Emphasis will be on as much open discussion as possible, rather than conference-style one-way presentations.
     Nevertheless, the moderator must control the discussion to avoid distracting tangents or unhelpful threads.
   **Action:** Discussion among committee members and guests. All concurred on this format and approach.
4. **Discussion**: Other issues about the Forum:
   - GEC will meet on Monday 20 April to finalize the Read-Ahead Packets to be then emailed to all RSU faculty a.s.a.p. thereafter.
   - Also the GEC will discuss the format, anticipate questions, and determine the key issues/topics to mention to keep the Forum focused, yet still allow RSU faculty to get buy-in by voicing their concerns.

   **Action**: Discussion and agreement.

**Next Meeting**: 20 April at 2:00 in BH-101

**Adjournment**: Motion to adjourn 3:07 Moved. Seconded. Passed unanimously.