The meeting was called to order by GEC chair Carolyn Vander Schee.

I. Adoption of Agenda
Montgomery made a motion, seconded by Polansky, TO ADOPT THE AGENDA FOR THE APRIL 21, 2016, GEC MEETING. At the request of a committee member who needed to leave early, action items (IV.B. and IV.D.) were moved up in the agenda. **Motion passed unanimously as amended.**

II. Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the March 24, 2016, GEC meeting were previously approved.

III. Announcements
   A. Curricular Approval Process Update. The GEC was provided a diagram illustrating the new curricular process that was recently approved by the University Council (UC). Curricular changes will go from the colleges directly to the Baccalaureate Council (BC), which will take over the responsibilities of the CUC and APASC. The BC will report directly to the UC. The only change to the GEC will be that there will be a representative from the college advising directors as an ex-officio, non-voting member. The Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education (CIUE) and the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment (CUAE) will merge into the Committee for the Improvement of the Undergraduate Academic Experience (CIUAE), which will report to the BC. It was clarified that the advisor on the GEC will provide context on the impact of GEC decisions on advising. Kot asked if there will be advisors on the BC and Klonoski replied that there would be one representative from advising on the BC. He added that the BC will have a wide range of representation from across campus. It was also noted that having advisors on these committees should provide opportunities for better communication with others who do advising.

IV. Old Business
   A. Assessment Plan. Five rubrics were provided to the GEC. These have been vetted by a number of constituents around campus. They were created based on most of the university’s
eight Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). There are several other SLOs for which rubrics are still to be developed. It was Klonoski’s recommendation that a letter be sent to everyone teaching general education courses that assessment data will be collected every semester the course is taught and to provide those instructors with the rubrics that are currently available. It is hoped that these instructors could also provide feedback on the rubrics. Pathways coordinators will collect assessment data from the courses in their respective Pathways and Parker will collect data on the courses that aren’t in a Pathway. Discussion followed regarding exactly what kind of assessment data needs to be collected and on how many courses and students. It was clarified that a sampling of students could be done, but that it should be done for every general education course. Parker said that there are some details he still needs to work out regarding the mechanics of how data will be collected (e.g., uploading to Blackboard, etc.). But the intent is to make the submission of data as easy as possible. It is also the hope that the rubrics can become part of the teaching and learning process and that will make it much easier to collect data. There was a discussion on the Pathway coordinators’ role in data collection and submission. There was also discussion about what parts of the rubric can change. Parker said that each rubric must have four levels and that there has to be general agreement on what each level represents. But after that, the rubrics may be modified according to the discipline and the specific course. The GEC discussed when the assessment plan will be introduced to instructors. The overall consensus was to get instructors the information on rubrics as soon as possible so that they can start using them and provide feedback to the GEC and Parker and his office. At the very least, instructors teaching foundational studies courses should begin collecting their assessment data in the fall, 2016. Parker also explained that the development of the rubrics was based on a number of sources, such as AAC&U references and NIU foundational studies subject matter experts. Some committee members expressed concern that the assessment process adopted by the GEC be mindful of the current workload of those teaching courses with large numbers of students. The GEC ultimately decided to send the rubrics to department chairs and Pathways coordinators asking them to distribute to their instructors. Chairs and coordinators will be provided with guidance on how the rubrics may be customized, to use them this fall and send feedback back to the GEC, and to save any data they do collect with the rubrics.

B. Pathways Coordinators—Memo of understanding (MOU). Committee members were provided with a draft of a memo of understanding for the Pathways coordinators. Vander Schee explained that she kept it vague and broad in scope intentionally. She noted that she added an annual review of the coordinators. Discussion followed regarding changes to make to the MOU. Committee members discussed adding something about ensuring integration of the Pathways themes across courses, adding and deleting courses from the Pathways, and collecting and submitting assessment data. Thu made a motion, seconded by Quinlan, TO APPROVE THE PATHWAYS COORDINATORS MEMO OF UNDERSTANDING AS AMENDED. It was clarified that the assessment bullet will be moved higher in the list and there will be an additional bullet point to address the need for adding and deleting courses as need be. Motion passed unanimously. Vander Schee will next e-mail the Pathways coordinators the updated MOU and ask them to sign it. Thu then asked if a coordinator was found for the Learning Pathway. Klonoski reported that he spoke with Wei-Chen Hung, who developed that Pathway, and there is a faculty member from his department who is willing to take on the position. However, that individual is not teaching a course in the Pathway. Before they can take on the role, Klonoski wanted to be sure this was acceptable with the GEC. Committee members agreed to electronically approve this person as the Learning Pathway coordinator. Klonoski also reported that two individuals expressed interest in the coordinator position for the Global Connections Pathway well past the deadline. He suggested to them that they reach out to Abu Bah who will be the coordinator of that Pathway to see if they can assist him.
C. Publicizing pathways/student feedback. Vander Schee reported that she, Klonoski, and Director of Marketing Abby Dean have been working on ways to market general education and the Pathways to students and hope to have materials available during summer orientation.

D. ANTH 302. This course is being applied for the Society and Culture knowledge domain and the Society, Justice, and Diversity Pathway. This would not be effective until the 2017-18 catalog. Thu said they did a good job and Vander Schee added that it is a strong application. Thu also reported that the course has been taught for many years. Gorman made a motion, seconded by Coller, TO APPROVE ANTH 302 FOR THE SOCIETY AND CULTURE KNOWLEDGE DOMAIN AND THE SOCIAL JUSTICE AND DIVERSITY PATHWAY. Motion passed unanimously. A discussion followed regarding the process of approving courses for a Pathway going forward. It was decided that a signature line for the Pathway coordinator should be added to the course application and that the application process and contact information for all of the Pathways coordinators be added to the general education webpage.

V. New Business

A. Pathways Minor. Klonoski reported that he has been talking to various groups around campus about what the general education task force proposed regarding a Pathways minor. Right now the Pathways focus in in place with the 2016-17 catalog. Students who take one course from each knowledge domain in one Pathway will have that noted on their transcripts. The Pathways minor would require two courses in each of the three knowledge domains, six courses total, with at least three in the upper divisions (300 or 400 level). The courses taken for a Pathways minor can also simultaneously count towards other minors. Because students can count the courses towards other minors, there is no impact on other minors and it is hoped this will encourage students to pursue other minors.

VI. Adjournment

Thu made a motion, seconded by Zhou, TO ADJOURN. The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m. by acclamation.

The next meeting is scheduled for September 15, 2016.

Respectfully submitted by Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator