

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Thursday, April 19, 2018

MINUTES
Approved

Present: E. Klonoski (Ex-officio, Associate Vice Provost), J. Kot (LAS/FL&L), M. Lenczewski (LAS/GEOL/ENVS), L. Matuszewich (LAS/PSYC), B. Montgomery (HHS/FCNS), C. Ornelas (HHS/Student), J. Pendergrass (BUS/OMIS), M. Pickett (Academic Advising Center), A. Polansky (LAS/MATH), M. Quinlan (VPA/ART), D. Smith (Catalog Editor), L. Sunderlin (LAS/CHEM/BC), Z. Wang (EET/ISYE)

The meeting was called to order by GEC Chair Polansky. He announced that this would be his last meeting as GEC chair.

- I. Adoption of Agenda. Lenczewski made a motion, seconded by Sunderlin, TO ADOPT THE AGENDA FOR THE APRIL 19, 2018, GEC MEETING. **Motion passed unanimously.**
- II. Approval of the January 18, 2018, minutes. Minutes from the January 18, 2018, GEC, meeting were approved electronically.
- III. Announcements.
None
- IV. Old Business
 - A. Assessment Plan. Klonoski reported that he has not heard from the Assessment Office regarding the General Education assessment plan, which was submitted last spring (2017). Klonoski also reported that he has been collecting assessment data from general education faculty either through Blackboard or through other methods faculty have used. He has received feedback that using the assessment tools on Blackboard is not burdensome. His graduate assistant has put together a database to house data. A report of the assessment data was provided to the GEC and it is for the BlackBoard data that was collected according to each Student Learning Outcome (SLO). Klonoski explained the table. These data were used for the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) report. He reminded the GEC that NIU will have an HLC assurance review this summer. The HLC did a site-visit for accreditation in 2014. The next step is to check on some of the things NIU said they would take care of. That report is due in June. Klonoski was asked to write the General Education portion and will share with the GEC. The report includes a description of what used to be done for assessment and how it is being done now. The data he will provide is from spring and fall 2017 and spring 2018. He also has been working on individual faculty reports, which will look similar to the report provided to GEC members at today's meeting. But those will be customized for the individual courses faculty are teaching.

Klonoski presented a draft of the letter that will go to faculty with the assessment reports and asked GEC members for their feedback. He noted he worked on the letter with Polansky. Some minor edits were suggested. Klonoski also asked for the GEC's feedback on where the assessment data should be housed. Currently, it is located on his GA's laptop. But it needs to be housed in a location that is more secure and he suggested the network directory for the Office of the Provost, with the vice provost, associate vice provost, and the GEC chair given access. Committee members agreed this is an appropriate plan for housing the data.

Sunderlin made a motion, seconded by Quinlan, THAT THE GEC RECOMMEND TO THE VICE PROVOST THAT GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE ASSESSMENT DATA BE HOUSED ON THE PROVOST'S OFFICE NETWORK SERVER WITH ACCESS GRANTED TO THE VICE PROVOST, ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST FOR UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM, AND THE CHAIR OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE. **Motion passed unanimously.**

- B. Pathways Coordinators. Klonoski reported that the coordinators are preparing updates for the GEC and he will share those when they are available. Klonoski asked GEC members what they would like to see from the Pathways coordinators in terms of updates. One suggestion was to have a more of hands-on relationship with the coordinators and to have them be part of the committee. The duties of the coordinators were outlined. A discussion followed regarding how to better get the word out to students regarding the Pathways, including adding the Pathways to the degree progress report in MyNIU. Pickett replied that if the Pathways were in MyNIU, students may see that they needed to complete a Pathway rather than it being optional. There also was a discussion about reviewing the Pathways and their courses to determine if any should be removed. Matuszewich wondered if having the coordinators attend all the GEC meetings would add additional burden to their responsibilities. It would be more efficient to invite them to one meeting to have a conversation. There was a question about getting the number of students taking courses for each Pathway. It was noted that this information is difficult to obtain because there is no way to know which students are taking a course as part of a Pathway or not. Pickett said if there was a way students could say they are pursuing a Pathway, that would help the conversation between students and advisers.

Committee members discussed other issues with the Pathways that should be discussed in the next academic year, such as thoroughly evaluating each Pathway and the courses and look at enrollment in the Pathways if possible. It was also decided that Pathways coordinators would be invited to attend one GEC meeting each semester. Those meetings would be to have conversations with the coordinators to find out the progress of their Pathways as well as find out what they need from the GEC in order to be successful. Kot made a motion, seconded by Matuszewich TO INVITE THE PATHWAYS COORDINATORS TO THE A GEC MEETING IN THE FALL SEMESTER AND ANOTHER GEC MEETING IN THE SPRING SEMESTER. The Pathways coordinators would also be asked to provide any information they may find useful.

- C. Pathways Minor. Klonoski reported the Pathways Minor is on hold for the moment. He has received a lot of feedback from around the campus. He has the impression that people thought the draft of the minor was further along in the process and thought it was more of a done deal. Kot said she has not heard from the coordinator of the Pathway she is involved in. Klonoski suggested that she reach out to the coordinator. There was additional discussion about the status of the Pathways (see also discussion under Pathways Coordinators above).

V. New Business

- A. Bylaws. The purpose of the change is to update titles. There are two versions, one with the vice provost and director of Accreditation, Assessment and Evaluation, the other adds the associate vice provost for undergraduate studies. Smith said the current version has all three positions. There was a brief discussion regarding the two versions. Polansky made a motion seconded by Montgomery, TO APPROVE THE BYLAWS REVISIONS WITH THE SECOND VERSION (I.E., ALL THREE POSITIONS AS EX-OFFICIO, NON-VOTING MEMBERS). **Motion passed unanimously.** See Appendix A for the revisions.

VI. Other Business. Klonoski mentioned that a chair for the GEC will need to be elected. He would prefer that it was someone who has previously served on the GEC for consistency. Polansky noted that it is not an onerous position.

VII. Adjournment

Montgomery made a motion, seconded by Pendergrass, to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m. by acclamation.

The next meeting is scheduled for September 27, 2018.

Respectfully submitted by Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator

Appendix A. General Education Committee Bylaws Revisions

15.6.2 General Education Committee

15.6.2.1 Composition

(A) Faculty Representation

↓

(B) Student Representation

↓

(C) Administrative Representation

1. One advisor shall be elected by and from the persons with overall responsibility for undergraduate advisement in each of the undergraduate degree-granting colleges and the Academic Advising Center. The person shall serve ex officio without a vote.

2. The following shall serve ex officio without a vote: the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs responsible for undergraduate education or his or her designee; the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; the Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Curriculum, and the Associate Vice Provost for Academic Assessment the Director, Accreditation, Assessment and Evaluation or his or her designee.

15.6.2.2 Duties

↓

15.6. Standing Committees of the Baccalaureate Council

↓

Rationale: To align the language with proper titles as well as have an option for the individuals to appoint designees in their places.