

July 14th Meeting of the IGEOC

Agenda

- A. **Discussion and Decision: Purpose of the Checklists** – Let’s reach some consensus here. My position is that the checklists are focused on the Area Objectives and have their natural place between the 10 Areas and the Classroom. As such, the checklists are a tool to see if the AOs (which may be a combination of pathways and outcomes) in a particular area are included in the syllabus; and if the syllabus offers convincing evidence that they can be addressed. For example, a syllabus that parrots all the outcomes for Inquiry in the Humanities (check), but which claims to be able to achieve those by only reading the Ancient Mariner, analyzing Hayden’s Those Winter Sundays and creating a three-slide powerpoint on each, as the assessable artifact (no check), would be returned with constructive comments. Otherwise, if the language of the template is there, or even better language that contains but dwarfs the template language, and the plan for addressing the objectives is reasonable, it passes. This is a radical trust of our colleagues, I realize. But I tend to be radical on that point.
- B. **Discussion and Decision: A Potential Mitigation** – That’s mitigation, not litigation. Though you may want to fire me and sue me after reading this. I understand the need to be aware of the differences between what a teacher will claim to do and what a student will be claimed to be able to do. That difference is fundamental. We can raise the level of what we do as a Committee by embracing the purpose above as the *raison d’etre* of the Checklist, but we can add a box where we simply ask the submitter to offer a couple of paragraphs of rationale as to how s/he sees her/his approach to the AO being mapped to some subset of the overarching four student learning outcomes. This accomplishes two things. First, we make sure everyone is aware of those four as they prepare their submissions. And second, if the rationale is terribly faulty for how they will be addressed by this course’s interpretation of the AOs, then we can reject the proposal. I’d want this to be short (quarter of a page) and us to be broad-minded in our evaluation of what was written. My goal would be to make people smarter and more aware; not to try and create doctorates in EDU by way of the submission process.
- C. **Discussion and Decision: A Common Format for Checklists** - I would suggest that no information on the cover needs to be repeated on the checklist if they are together as a packet (see below). But the checklists themselves need to have the same format. We need to decide if we are going to offer comments after each “show me were/explain” pairing that all seem to have adopted. I would suggest that we do. Also we need to have an “accepted” “not accepted” dichotomy clearly on the front and top of the forms, and a place at the end for comments on the SLO mapping if we decide to go with the mitigation suggested in B.
- D. **Discussion and Decision: A Common Format for Submissions** – Once we get the larger issues in hand, let’s agree on a format for the submission process. I would suggest that until this can go electronic we get the entire packet stapled together (cover sheet, new course/course change form if needed, syllabus, checklist) in that order. We need to decide what happens next. If approved and there are new course/course change forms present, I suspect it goes to UGC. Mike is that true? If no such forms are there, I suspect it still goes UGC for some time of automatic blessing. We need to weigh in here. If it is rejected, I propose it goes back to the Associate Dean who sent it.