GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
203rd Meeting
Thursday, January 17, 2013

MINUTES
Approved

Present: A. Birberick (Ex-officio, Vice Provost), (B. Coller (EET/MEE), D. Gorman (LAS/ENGL), E. Klonoski (VPA/MUSC), M. Kolb (Ex-officio, General Education Coordinator), L. Lundstrum, W. Luo (LAS/GEOG), S. Morris (Ex-officio, Assessment Services), D. Smith (Catalog Editor), J. Umoren (HHS/FCNS), C. Vander Schee (EDU/LEPF/UCC), K. Wiemer (LAS/PSYC/UCC)

I. Adoption of Agenda

Gorman asked if the General Education Coordinator’s report could be moved to later in the agenda and if the Submissions could be moved to after Assessment under Old Business. Umoren made a motion, seconded by Lundstrum, to APPROVE THE AGENDA AS AMENDED. Motion passed unanimously.

II. Announcements

A. Minutes for the November 15, 2012, meeting were approved electronically through Vibe.

III. Old Business

A. Assessment Plan. Gorman reported that two things were required for the HLC visit: 1) a searchable database, which Kolb has been working on, and 2) a structured assessment plan, which Gorman has worked on and has an initial draft available. It was clarified that the structured assessment plan should be sent to Morris, but she noted that it should be voted on by the GEC. This will be posted to Vibe for GEC members to review and to provide feedback. Ultimately what is needed is meaningful data on the general education program from past years in preparation for the HLC visit.

B. Submissions.

1. CLCE 100. Gorman reminded the GEC that a syllabus was needed for this submission as well as the identification of more specific goals that the course will address. Committee members were provided with this information. Klonoski made a motion, seconded by Lundstrum, TO APPROVE CLCE 100 AS A GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE IN THE INTERDISCIPLINARY AREA. Motion passed unanimously.

2. ARTH courses, POLS 201, and ARTE 109. Nothing more has been received. Gorman asked about the procedure. If these were approved by the GEC pending receipt of additional information, can he just report that the information was received and the course can moved forward. Coller responded that this would be appropriate.

C. Resubmissions/Subcommittees.
1. Gorman reminded the GEC that they heard from Subcommittee A, who worked on the ARTH submissions. [Note: This subcommittee was also assigned PHIL 205, which still needs to be brought to GEC.]

2. Subcommittee B. For ANTH 240, the subcommittee reported that the department needs to provide a rubric for their assignments and they expressed concern about the question used for assessing the course. Coller explained that the question is very open ended and Klonoski added that it is a pre- and post-test using the question. However, without a rubric, it’s difficult to tell exactly how answers to the question are being assessed. Discussion followed regarding how to follow-up. Morris asked if the GEC expects departments to analyze their results. Klonoski noted that in his experience with resubmissions, they almost all just say that they’ve looked at assessment data and make changes to the course accordingly. They don’t give specifics. Morris said that her office requires that programs include specific ways in which data have been analyzed and used. But the GEC cannot criticize these resubmissions for the lack of specificity if this isn’t something that is asked for. It was suggested that the department be asked to tighten up their pre-/post-test question, but Morris noted that this may be acceptable in this discipline. However, a rubric at the very least is needed, and that may help explain how the question is assessed. Gorman will follow-up with the department and ask for a rubric for questions 1 and 2 and to ask them to explain the parenthetical phrase in question 1 that students don’t have to actually do the calculation. Regarding CSCI 205, the resubmission is missing a sample of an assignment, which is specifically requested in the resubmission form. Regarding BIOS 105, there was no data, but Fall 2012 was the first time the course was offered for general education credit. They did provide questions that will be used to assess general education goals. Committee members agreed that this is sufficient at this time. Coller made a motion, seconded by Luo, to APPROVE THE RESUBMISSIONS FOR BIOS 103, BIOS 106, BIOS 107, BIOS 109, ELE 100, FCNS 201, AND STAT 208. Motion passed unanimously. Coller will forward to Gorman other minor issues this subcommittee had with their resubmissions.

3. Subcommittee C. The subcommittee reported that the resubmissions for the CHEM courses and ISYE 100 were acceptable. The MATH 229 resubmission is acceptable pending the receipt of a syllabus. Vander Schee made a motion, seconded by Wiemer, TO APPROVE THE RESUBMISSIONS FOR CHEM 100, CHEM 110, CHEM 111, CHEM 210, CHEM 211, CHEM 212, CHEM 213, ISYE 100, AND MATH 229, WITH MATH 229 PROVIDING A SYLLABUS. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Subcommittee D. Klonoski reported that all the resubmissions for GEOL courses are acceptable except GEOL 121, which is taught solely by TAs and there is no assessment data. Morris responded that the department should still be able to provide data. Discussion followed regarding the data the department might have for this course. It was noted that this course is offered several times per semester, which would allow the department plenty of opportunities to collect assessment data this spring and submit a follow-up report to the GEC in the fall. Klonoski made a motion, seconded by Umore, TO APPROVE THE RESUBMISSIONS FOR GEOF 101, GEOF 102, GEOF 105, GEOF 106, GEOF 103, GEOF 104, GEOF 105, AND GEOF 120. Motion passed unanimously.

D. Working Rules. It was noted that Kolb has updated the Working Rules and it was clarified that these are for the GEC’s use and there is no need to add them to the General Education web page.

E. General Education Revision. See the General Education Coordinator’s report below. An update was also provided regarding the revision to the GEC’s bylaws. The Undergraduate Coordinating Council (UCC) received the GEC minutes in which those changes were made,
and this will next go to the University Council (UC). Birberick will work with UC Executive Secretary Alan Rosenbaum on how to present the bylaw revisions to the UC. If there are any wording changes, she will poll the GEC for their feedback.

IV. New Business

There was no new business.

V. General Education Coordinator’s Report

Kolb reported that the General Education Visioning Task Force will meet for the first time on January 18, 2013. Provost Alden will give the group their charge. Kolb provided the GEC the list of the task force’s members. He added that the membership tries to target as many constituencies from the university as possible. The main task this semester is to develop a mission statement, then next academic year to work earnestly to develop plans for general education revisions. Gorman asked about the time line and Kolb responded that there is a three-semester commitment for task force members. Kolb also reported that collection of assessment data is moving forward and he has now met with all of the college deans.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

The next meeting will be February 21, 2013, Altgeld 225.

Respectfully submitted by Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator