

INTERCOLLEGE COORDINATION PANEL

MEETING MINUTES

13 October 2000

Karen Pence, Rich Gallagher, Kevin Donnelly, Jan Wissman, Maureen Herspring and Caleb Blanding were present at the October 13, 2000 meeting. Caleb Blanding took the minutes for the October 13, 2000, meeting.

DISCUSSION OF MINUTES

The minutes for the September 15, 2000, meeting of the ICCP were approved as distributed.

PHASE II ASSESSMENT TEAM (P2) PROPOSAL

Gallagher had forwarded the ICCP's concerns about the P2 proposal to Jim Goddard, chair of the UGE Task Force. Goddard replied with the following updates to the proposal, which will be voted on at the November 2 UGE Task Force meeting.

Priority II of the proposal recommended that administration of a survey for advisors be coordinated at the college level with ICCP representatives and the UGE Task Force having key roles in the process of developing a survey for advisors. The details of this survey were requested by the ICCP and Goddard agreed that this section of the proposal will be revised for clarity.

Donnelly stated that many curricula were created so UGE is included. Having UGE built into curricula eliminates many problems since advisors are required to be very aware of the requirements. The starting point for a questionnaire could be to ask if there have been any issues or problems where students have not met UGE requirements.

Priority III of the proposal recommends that college enrollments and availability of UGE Program courses be monitored and reported at the level of the college. Gallagher received clarification from Goddard about the details of the ICCP's involvement in the monitoring and reporting of this information. The Task Force recommended that a report would be created by associate deans which includes a listing of upper- and lower-level course availability. The paragraph stating Priority III will be reworded to include the details.

Priority IV asks whether college UGE programs have been implemented as approved and if they are effective. The means by which a program's effectiveness will be measured is not clear in the proposal, and Goddard stated that the measures for evaluating effectiveness will be developed.

Priority VI asks if the course approval process is efficient and effective and if the committee structure is efficient, effective and a fair use of faculty time. The phrase "and a fair use of

faculty time" will be omitted to eliminate redundancy.

The UGE Task Force will vote on the revised P2 proposal at its November 2, 2000, meeting. The ICCP will then receive the proposal for discussion at its November 17, 2000, meeting.

UGE COURSES

Gallagher asked if any problems have existed with the availability of upper-division UGE courses. Herspring stated that in the College of Architecture, students would benefit from more options since they are sometimes forced into taking upper-division courses that are not of much interest to them. Another concern is that there may not be enough intersession courses available for UGE credit. Pence stated that in Human Ecology, the students generally take the same UGE courses as many other colleges' students, which leads to crowded classrooms and difficulty when enrolling. To minimize this problem, there has been mention of the possibility of holding seats open for students who wish to take such courses as UGE.

Between now and the November 17, 2000 meeting, ICCP members will be evaluating the enrollment process in their colleges to determine if problems exist.

DARS

The question was raised about the effectiveness of DARS. Many members of the ICCP expressed concerns about the lack of speed in using the system. Gallagher will follow up to determine if and what can be done to improve this process.

The meeting was adjourned.

The next ICCP meeting will be November 17, 2000, from noon to 1:00 in room 301 of Calvin Hall.