GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
228th Meeting
Thursday, February 18, 2016

MINUTES
Approved

Present: B. Coller (EET/MEE), D. Gorman (LAS/ENGL), J. Kot (LAS/FL--), B. Montgomery (HHS/FCNS), A. Polansky (LAS/MATH), K. Thu (LAS/ANTH), D. Smith (Catalog Editor), C. Pluim (Vander Schee) (EDU/LEPF), L. Zhou (BUS/FINA)

The meeting was called to order by GEC chair Carolyn Pluim.

I. **Adoption of Agenda**
Zhou made a motion, seconded by Polansky, TO ADOPT THE AGENDA FOR THE FEBRUARY 18, 2016, GEC MEETING. Smith said that the agenda should read approval of the January 21, 2016, minutes, not the November, 2015, minutes. Motion passed unanimously as amended.

II. **Approval of Minutes**
The minutes from the January 21, 2016, GEC meeting were previously approved.

III. **Announcements**

A. Pluim reported on what the GEC will be doing in this meeting as well as the rest of spring semester. The GEC received a copy of Spring Action Items and Pluim went through those.

1. **Pathways Coordinators Invitation.** Pluim reported that she sent out the invitation to faculty who were listed as the current coordinators of Pathways. The invitation asks them to submit their interest in the coordinator position or share with the other faculty listed with the Pathways. She has received replies from a few faculty and will follow-up with the rest of the Pathways. It was noted that the term is two years with a $2,000 stipend each year.

2. **Assessment plan.** Pluim reported that Birberick, Klonoski, and Parker are at a conference, but she will be meeting with them to discuss in detail an assessment plan for general education that should be presented to GEC members prior to the next meeting. She asked GEC members to be prepared to discuss this at the next meeting. Thu suggested that the plan be simple, noting that with past assessment plans it hasn’t always been easy to submit assessment materials. Having programmatic assessment rather than departmental assessment would make the process easier for departments. Thu added that he would leave any details for an assessment up to the expertise of Parker. It was also suggested that if general education assessment could align with other programmatic assessment, that could help make it easier. Coller noted that at some point the GEC would need data from individual general education courses. Thu responded that the plan could be set up as to make that data collection less onerous on departments and maybe more centralized. Pluim said that the GEC will also need to consider where the data would come from, for example Pathways coordinators, department chairs, instructors, etc. Coller said that there are rubrics for each of the eight SLOs and those could provide
some uniformity. Gorman explained that assessment should be used to evaluate whether or not things are working in the classroom and, if not, the instructor needs to make adjustments. Pluim said that each general education course was asked to select two SLOs for assessment and a signature assignment, so what the GEC asks for regarding general education courses should be fairly simple.

3. Student survey about Pathways titles. Pluim asked for volunteers to serve on a subcommittee that would plan for getting student feedback on the Pathways titles. It was clarified that the purpose for obtaining student feedback would be to change the titles of any of the Pathways if students felt the current titles weren’t appealing. There was a brief discussion about having student focus groups. Kot suggested an electronic form or survey for students who are commuting, working full time, etc., whose time on campus is limited. Pluim said that would be the job of a subcommittee, to determine what ways would be best to get student feedback. Thu suggested feedback could be obtained through advisors when the Pathways get presented to students as they are registering for classes and have instructors/faculty teaching general education class poll their students. Other suggestions were asking the Student Association and focus groups. Montgomery suggested that the descriptions of the Pathways need to be included with the title when asking for feedback.

4. General education website clean-up. Pluim reported that she may ask for a subcommittee to look at the general education website to see what changes need to be made.

5. Equivalent foundational studies courses. This discussion will be postponed to next meeting. But what the GEC will have to determine is guidelines and criteria other courses need to meet in order to be approved for one of the foundational studies courses.

IV. Old Business

A. New course applications: PSYC 219, SOCI 356, HIST 389. Nothing more received. Smith will follow-up on these courses.

B. Subcommittee for GEC reorganization. No report.

C. Assessment Plan. See discussion above.

V. New Business

A. Pathways Coordinators. Pluim reported that she heard back from three of the current coordinators who are interested in the permanent positions. She will reach out to the rest of the leaders who are currently listed on pathways applications. Hopefully by next meeting there will be coordinators for all of the seven Pathways.

B. Publicizing Pathways/Student Feedback. See discussion above. Coller volunteered to draft a survey. Zhou asked what grade level the survey would be targeted at and Thu wondered if it might be beneficial to send it to instructors at Kishwaukee Community College. Discussion followed regarding how to get student feedback as well as how the Pathways are being publicized.

VI. Adjournment

Thu made a motion, seconded by Gorman, TO ADJOURN. Motion passed by acclamation. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.
The next meeting is scheduled for March 24, 2016.

Respectfully submitted by Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator.