GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
221st Meeting
Thursday, March 26, 2015

MINUTES
Approved

Present: A. Birberick (Ex-officio, Vice Provost), B. Coller (EET/MEE), D. Gorman (LAS/ENGL), B. Jaffee (for M. Quinlan, VPA/ART), E. Klonoski (Ex-officio, Acting Associate Vice Provost), J. Kot (LAS/FL--/UCC), B. Montgomery (HHS/FCNS), C. Parker (Ex-officio, associate vice provost for Academic Outcomes Assessment), D. Smith (Catalog Editor), C. Thompson (LAS/PHYS/UCC), C. Vander Schee (EDU/LEPF/UCC)

The meeting was called to order by GEC chair Gorman.

I. Adoption of Agenda
Kot made a motion, seconded by Thompson, TO ADOPT THE AGENDA FOR THE MARCH 26, 2015, GEC MEETING. Kot asked that an item be added to agenda for a brief discussion regarding assessment. Gorman said it could be placed under IV.C. He also has another point of discussion for that item. Birberick asked if IV.D. could be moved up in the agenda since she needs to leave early. Motion passed unanimously as amended.

II. Approval of Minutes
Montgomery made a motion, seconded by Thompson, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 26, 2015, GEC MEETING. Klonoski said that he is no longer the VPA representative; that should be changed to Mary Quinlan. Motion passed as amended with one abstention.

III. Announcements
A. The minutes from the February 19, 2015, were approved electronically.
B. Annual Assessment Update—Chris Parker. Parker explained that this is the report summary of the annual update that each degree program is required to submit. Parker’s office provides detailed feedback, specifically on the assessment methods the programs talk about, then his office compiles a report on the health of assessment campus wide. The report is broken down by college, then by degree program within each college. His office provides formative feedback. Gorman observed that the general education program is not represented in this report. Parker responded that he is open to suggestions as to how this information can be parsed in a way that is more useful to the GEC. It was noted that SLOs have now been identified for general education courses, and faculty members can tie an assignment to goals that are preprogrammed into the system. Then Parker’s office can sample from those assignments and look at a more robust assessment of the general education program, or at least the SLOs. A brief discussion followed regarding rubrics for assessing SLOs.

IV. Old Business
A. Disposition of remaining action items. These items are still on hold.
   1. HIST 381 and HIST 382 (They needed to submit assessment data by spring, 2013.)
   2. Alternatives to MATH 101 (They were supposed to submit by June, 2015, nothing received to date.)
   3. ISYE 335. Coller was to follow-up with department to assist with revising the resubmission.
   4. There are other courses for which the GEC is still needing data (ANTH 210, ANTH 220, ANTH 230, ECON 160, ECON 260, ECON 261, POLS 150, POLS 220, POLS 260, SOCI 170, SOCI 250, SOCI 260, SOCI 270)

   The GEC discussed the status of these items. It was decided that due to the new PLUS program, the outstanding data required for these courses will no longer be required. The departments will be communicated with to let them know. See also discussion in B. below.

B. 2014-15 Resubmissions (Humanities and Arts). This is still on hold. Birberick said that these departments will not be asked to submit the resubmission data. With general education moving to a different set of outcomes, it doesn’t make sense to ask people to engage in that activity. However, the departments need to be informed that assessment data will be collected on the new SLOs; the Higher Learning Commission will still need to see assessment data. Montgomery made a motion, seconded by Kot, that THE DEPARTMENTS WITH COURSES IN THE HUMANITIES AND ARTS AREA OF THE CURRENT (2014-15) GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM BE INFORMED THAT THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE WILL NO LONGER BE ASKING FOR RESUBMISSIONS UNDER THE OLD SYSTEM. THE COMMUNICATION TO THE DEPARTMENTS NEEDS TO BE CLEAR THAT ASSESSMENT DATA WILL STILL BE REQUIRED UNDER THE PLUS PROGRAM AND DEPARTMENTS WILL BE INFORMED HOW TO DO THAT IN THE COMING ACADEMIC YEAR. The items in A. above were also discussed and it was decided a similar letter should be sent to those departments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

C. PLUS. PLUS Enrichment Course Development Plan. It was reported that the Registration and Records staff are about 90% done coding the PLUS program in MyNIU. The first informational sessions for Pathways have been held; there were about 25-30 in attendance at each meeting. Gorman asked what is the next step. Klonoski said that in the Pathways coordinators meeting, they have been able to see where there is overlap with courses and how many faculty all together are involved. Kot asked about the requirement for collaborative activities and that there seemed to be a suggestion that each subgroup focus on a question and to share a collaborative activity together. Klonoski explained that if there’s a signature assignment, that would be great, but there is no requirement to cluster the activities. Gorman asked for clarification on the foundational courses. According to the PLUS language, it sounds like other departments can propose courses that could fulfill the Oral Communication requirement. Klonoski explained that when names were chosen for the foundational studies requirements (e.g., quantitative literacy, oral communication, and rhetoric and composition) they were made broad so that any department could offer courses in the foundational studies. He added, however, that the GEC is going to have to decide on the vetting system for any new foundational studies courses. The GEC will need to make sure that any courses proposed as an equivalent in these areas is indeed the equivalent.

D. Subcommittee for GEC reorganization. Birberick provided an update. She presented the current curricular approval process and Undergraduate Coordinating Council (UCC) committee model vs. a new model. The new model has four of the UCC committees combined into two, with Honors and the GEC being removed from reporting directly to the UCC. The UCC would be dissolved in lieu of the Baccalaureate Curriculum Council (BCC-
-a combination of the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum [CUC] and the Academic Policies and Admissions Standards Committee [APASC]). The Honors and General Education Committees would still report on their activities, but it would not be required that their committee minutes be received by the BCC. Birberick said she has been working with Faculty Senate President Bill Pitney on these changes, which will go to the University Council, so she has yet to call the GEC subcommittee together. The BCC would have the same faculty composition as the UCC, i.e., the same faculty and student representation. In addition, the same ex-officio members from CUC and APASC would be a part of the BCC. The BCC would be the singular university-wide committee for undergraduate curriculum approval. Birberick said that this would allow for deadlines for the next catalog to be extended about four to six weeks. Kot asked about proposals for new general education courses. Birberick explained that new courses would go through the BCC. If the course is also to be considered for general education credit, it would also need to go to the GEC. There was a question about appointments to other committees and Birberick responded that that process has yet to be determined. There was also a discussion about the role of the GEC and would they have more authority. Birberick said that the subcommittee will still need to work on the GEC bylaws to further define the committee’s role. Klonoski pointed out working rules for the GEC could further define its roles. A discussion followed regarding the new model and how to ensure enough voices are heard in the curricular approval process.

V. New Business.

A. New course submission, WGST 201. Smith explained that the submission was submitted last fall in time for the 2015-16 catalog deadline, but it was never considered due to other business for the GEC. Smith added that because the GEC had delayed approval of new courses for general education credit, she corresponded with a faculty member from the College of Education and suggested that she put her own proposal on hold. A discussion followed regarding whether or not WGST 201 should be considered for general education credit and, if so, should it be under the new PLUS program and therefore placed in a Pathway, or simply accepted into one of the three knowledge domains. Montgomery made a motion, seconded by Thompson, TO ASK WGST 201 TO SUBMIT THE PLUS KNOWLEDGE DOMAIN ROLLOVER FORM FOR THEIR COURSE IN TIME FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT GEC MEETING. Motion passed unanimously. The GEC then discussed how to handle the potential proposal from the College of Education. In fairness, they should also be allowed to submit it for general education credit and not require that it be placed into a Pathway. The GEC discussed what should be required from the College of Education. It was decided to ask the faculty member in the College of Education to submit the rollover form as well as the relevant additional items required from the old form, such as a syllabus and sample assignment for assessment. Gorman will communicate to the respective parties regarding these new course proposals for general education credit.

VI. Adjournment

Montgomery made a motion, seconded by Thompson, TO ADJOURN. Motion passed by acclamation. The meeting adjourned at 2: 50 p.m.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 16, 2015.

Respectfully submitted by Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator