1. Approval of Amended Minutes from March 6th, 2017 - Approved
2. Approval of Minutes from March 29th, 2017- Approved
3. New Business
   a. Kyna provided information from the Faculty Senate meeting where the Provost issued a strong message that he wants a proposal on his desk after the May 8th emergency GEC meeting.
   b. Gen Ed Revision from PBK perspective (Chuck Adams)
      i. Dr. Adams reminded the council that Phi Beta Kappa is a very important badge of prestige for the institution.
      ii. He provided an overview of Phi Beta Kappa organization and the application process, demonstrating that it is a very rigorous and complex process.
      iii. He stated that during the site visit, the Chair of the PBK committee mentioned that she heard a lot of “noise” around the General Education curriculum revision.
      iv. She expressed concern that there is still no solid curriculum framework and stated that it would be helpful to have our Gen Ed framework in place by the PBK Committee on Qualifications meeting in July.
      v. A question was posed asking if keeping the curriculum the same would be acceptable in the sense that it is something stable for the PBK to examine.
      vi. Dr. Adams responded that while PBK did not indicate what they wanted the Gen Ed to look like, they do generally approve gen ed revisions. He stated the choice is likely do something interesting quickly or do nothing at all, but the PBK wants to see the faculty body in charge (i.e., GEC) take a vote soon.
   c. Gen Ed Revision from Trustee perspective (Jim Garey)
      i. Dr. Garey reminded the GEC that the Provost is laser focused on Performance Based Funding (PBF) and also concerned that the legislature may mandate our entire gen ed curriculum.
      ii. He stated Provost is concerned about excess hours and the complexity of the current Gen Ed Curriculum
      iii. He also reiterated that while the timing of RCM and gen ed revision may make some wary, there is no link between the two. At this point he introduced Greg Teague, Chair of the RCM Advisory Committee.
1. He confirmed that RCM models use SCH as a revenue source and conceded that a lot of that SCH goes to CAS; therefore, one can see why a new gen ed curriculum that migrates courses away from CAS could cause concern.

2. However, there are models being considered that have a hold harmless and transition process to correct for large movements of SCH. He reiterated that no one is looking to close departments upon roll-out of new gen ed curriculum.

3. He encouraged the GEC to remember that the university should make the budget models match the curriculum; the budget should not dictate the curriculum.

iv. Dr. Garey, being a USF Trustee, also stated that there have been discussions from the BOT about the complexity of the current Gen Ed and an assumption that complexity must mean it’s hard for students to follow.

1. A point was made that the Provost needs to “sell” our gen ed curriculum to students, employees and the BOG; he can’t “sell” the giant grab-bag that is our current system.

v. He also stated that he knows the Provost to be far sighted and he likely sees there is a call for more experiential content.

1. A request was made to define experiential content.

2. It was defined as internships, labs, service-learning, research, study abroad; all considered High Impact Practices by AAC&U.

vi. Dr. Garey also mentioned the Provost has a five-year plan to decrease the faculty-student ratio by hiring around 200 new faculty members.

d. Discussion of Gen Ed Values

i. A question was posed about why we should avoid content-based courses.

1. There is data from employees showing they want to know their new employees have a certain skill set, not discipline specific knowledge.

ii. Another concern was raised about the Provost’s call for limiting the number of choices students have.

1. There was general consensus from the Council that we did not agree with limiting the number of courses a student could choose from.

iii. A point was made student exit surveys show students don’t see coherence in the gen ed curriculum.

1. It was questioned whether this came from our poor job of “advertising” what the students are getting out of the current gen ed courses.

2. It was cautioned that we don’t want to be in the business of just offering giant intro courses, but rather faculty should be able to offer creative courses that are exciting to students.

3. A suggestion was made that GEC should articulate the gen ed categories, put all of our courses in the categories, then articulate that to the students.

iv. A comment was made that students are interested in skills in their own discipline and we should use the gen ed curriculum to teach them to be more broad.

1. It was pointed out that in the 21st century, students are going to university to get a job; it’s no longer done just to gain knowledge.

v. It was suggested that the GEC use the AAC&U Essential Learning Outcomes as a general framework for the revision. Several comments and concerns were raised.

1. There are a lot of values. Would each gen ed course be required to accomplish x number of outcomes?

2. Are these categories too broad/ too numerous?

3. Could we have integrative/applied learning throughout the curriculum?

4. Could we require 6 hours of HIP (3 of those having to be in the major) then allocate 9 hours to three general categories we approve of?

5. Can we restrict the number of courses students take within the major?
6. Capstone should be synthesis and integrative within the major; is that only plausible in skill-based programs (not necessarily); would need to require that majors identify a capstone-like course; need to avoid the term “capstone”

vi. Including diversity in the values will ease many minds
   a. Many programs already infuse diversity in their courses
   b. Could we include diversity as a potential outcome?

vii. The gen ed should fill gaps that majors aren’t providing to their students

viii. It should also allow for individual inquiry; students should be able to navigate the curriculum in a somewhat independent fashion

ix. There was a reminder to keep the discussion student-centered
   1. Concern that rushing on the revision is not student-centered
   2. Rebuttal that forcing another large group of students through a gen ed we agree needs to be fixed is also not student-centered

e. Charge to Gen Ed Revision Subcommittee
   1. Flesh out the AAC&U Essential Learning Outcome framework
   2. Craft a statement to PBK

f. A request was made to speak with academic advisors; a guest from student advocacy will attend the next meeting