This year, the University has been working on a number of significant issues related to Curriculum and Instruction. CIC has been involved in a central way in all of those conversations, particularly in reviewing University initiatives, making recommendations to administration, and ensuring that diverse faculty voices and perspectives are part of broader conversations about the University’s educational mission.

The first part of the year was consumed with the General Education reform process. The Committee received a report on the consultative process and progress of the General Education Reform Committee (GERC), after which we asked for ongoing updates as GERC continued to reflect on the questions and criticisms raised regarding the initial framework. Throughout the fall semester, we asked that members of the various GERC sub-committees join us in meetings to talk about their ongoing progress. CIC members provided incisive and helpful feedback, which was incorporated directly into the process and framework as the GERC and its sub-committees continued their work. Numerous members of CIC also joined GERC sub-committees and so were directly involved in the process. Related to Gen Ed reform, we also debated and consulted on the issues of the math competency, which was bound up in considerations of the Quantitative Experience Gen Ed requirement.

In addition, the CIC solicited a report from Darin Ellis on the EAA grade system, which we pleasantly noted was extremely successful in changing student success within courses. CIC invited Nathan Chavez (as a surrogate for Daren Hubbard) to come and speak to us about the decision-making process and progress regarding the shift to a new learning management software. The Committee requested further information from Dawn Medley regarding the reasons behind student departure. We hope to continue that conversation in the next academic year.

Finally, we ended the year with a focus on student success. In particular, we invited Robert Aguirre to talk about the Gateways to Completion Project. There were a number of critical questions raised by committee members regarding compensations and implementation, and we will continue to ask for reports on this effort going forward as they think about how/whether to expand the pilot project. We also met with Cathy Barrette regarding ongoing University assessment initiatives and made a series of recommendations regarding paths forward to implement and communicate assessment priorities to the broader university community.