GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
213th Meeting
Thursday, April 17, 2014

MINUTES
Approved

Present: C. Campbell (EDU/ETRA/UCC), D. Chakraborty (LAS/PHYS), B. Coller (EET/MEE), D. Gorman (LAS/ENGL), J. Johnson (EDU/SEED), E. Klonoski (VPA/MUSC), M. Kolb (Ex-officio, Acting Associate Vice Provost), L. Lundstrum (BUS/FINA), C. Parker (Ex-Officio, Director, Office of Assessment Services), D. Smith (Catalog Editor), K. Thu (LAS/ANTH), J. Umoren (HHS/FCNS), K. Wiemer (LAS/PSYC)

The meeting was called to order by GEC chair Umoren.

I. Adoption of Agenda

Wiemer made a motion, seconded by Coller, TO ADOPT THE AGENDA. Motion passed unanimously.

II. Approval of Minutes

Thu made a motion, seconded by Coller, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM MARCH 27, 2014. There was one clarification for IV.B. Motion passed as amended.

III. Announcements

Parker announced that a preliminary report has been received from the HLC. Overall the report was very complimentary regarding the general education program; there were no issues. The report was also favorable regarding the task force. There will not be any sanctions that will need follow-up. Thu asked if the report is available and Parker responded that it is just now being shared with the steering committee. The university has a few weeks to respond.

IV. Old Business

A. PLUS Task Force. Kolb reported he is still in the vetting process of the models and the data received from surveys and focus groups. He has spoken with all of the college senates, a number of departments, and some of the college curriculum committees to get additional feedback. McDonald asked which model is getting most favorable response. Kolb responded that various colleges have shown interest in different ways. For example he has visited with the College of Business a number of times at their request, and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will be making a joint formal response from the college senate. Kolb shared with the GEC some preliminary survey and focus group data that rank a variety of components, e.g., enhanced communication courses, HIPs, clusters, etc. Thu asked what happens in the process when there is wide variance of responses, i.e., disagreement among respondents. Kolb said that the task force considers all points-of-view as important. He added that the faculty have the final say. However,
it’s important to make a program attractive for students or they won’t come. There was a discussion on the approval process and it was noted that ultimately the University Council will sign off on the revised program. Kolb said that the models were constructed to be as diverse as possible, to offer several options and the result may be a fusion of the three models. Gorman asked about the timeline. Kolb said that between now and the fall the task force will discuss options. There are some components that could be phased in a later date, such as e-portfolios. He also said that the task force could prioritize the changes and implement some of the changes as early as fall, 2015, and phase in other components later. Kolb added that the report is due to Provost Freeman by early September. It will then go to the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum (CUC) and the GEC for feedback and approval.

B. 2013 General Education Assessment Plan.

1. Discuss the suggestions in the plan. Parker said that he sent out the alumni survey. Thu said he developed a draft of guiding principles. There was a discussion regarding whether the GEC should tie into the baccalaureate goals or keep separate general education goals. The consensus was that the general education program should assess baccalaureate goals, then the GEC could analyze those data, making sure appropriate courses go in appropriate distribution areas. The general education goals would be a subset of the baccalaureate goals. Umoren said that GEC could discuss assessment further once the new model is identified. A discussion followed regarding the types of assessment for the general education program and whether or not it should include course-based assessment. Kolb said that the GEC has to be able to evaluate the program and that means looking at courses and if they are appropriate for general education or not. Thu said that could be done by looking at what is actually being taught and the GEC should still do that. Umoren asked if the GEC should still be collecting data and Thu said that syllabi could be collected. Parker added that the GEC could collect a sample of student assignments. Parker also said that his office could be central point for that; there could be common rubrics to evaluate data from different areas. His office could assist with developing a common way to aggregate data that could be presented to the GEC for evaluation. Thu stated that once the new model is rolled out, the GEC could spend next year devoted to the assessment of the program. Klonoski suggested that the GEC should also work on how to evaluate course transfers. Since the articulation agreement defines transfer courses from community colleges, the issue is mostly with courses transferring from other four-year institutions. Thu suggested that the GEC could use the baccalaureate goals as a baseline.

C. Humanities and Arts Catalog Language. Johnson reported that he spoke with College of Education Associate Dean Fox and she is planning to write a response and will send it to Kolb. Kolb will follow up with Fox.

D. Follow-up for courses not yet approved.

1. HIST 381 and HIST 382. No report.

E. Core Competencies Resubmissions

1. Alternatives to MATH 101. No report (they have until June to provide data).

2. COMS 100 evaluation. The department did send in the data the GEC requested. Coller made a motion, seconded by Thu, TO ACCEPT THE RESUBMISSION FOR COMS 100. Motion passed unanimously.

F. Subcommittee to review PLUS recommendations. The subcommittee will meet next Tuesday.
G. ANTH 103 Submission. Klonoski said that the department made reference to a rubric that was missing. Thu will follow up with them. Coller made a motion, seconded by Johnson, TO APPROVE THE SUBMISSION OF ANTH 103 FOR GENERAL EDUCATION CREDIT PENDING RECEIPT OF THE RUBRIC. Motion passed unanimously.

H. Items from the CUC. Course revisions to GEOG 101, GEOG 102, and GEOG 105 were presented. Thu made a motion, seconded by Wiemer, TO APPROVE THESE COURSE REVISIONS. Motion passed unanimously.

V. New Business

A. ENGL 350 Submission. Umoren said that her program uses this course for their graduate students who score poorly in writing on the GRE. Coller said the submission looks really good. However, it was pointed out that the submission says that there are no prerequisites for the course, but it’s assumed they have taken course, and the GEC discussed if it was OK to allow them to state this. The GEC discussed what the department meant. It was clarified that this box on the submission form is for GEC purposes and they are simply stating that the catalog description doesn’t include prerequisites (Smith confirmed this is the case). Coller made a motion, seconded by Wiemer, TO APPROVE THE SUBMISSION OF ENGL 350 FOR GENERAL EDUCATION CREDIT. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Election of chair. This was postponed until the next meeting.

VI. Adjournment

A. A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. Motion passed by acclamation. The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

The next meeting will be April 24, 2014, Altgeld 225.

Respectfully submitted by Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator