General Education Committee

January 21, 2021
12:30 – 1:23 p.m.
Teams Virtual Meeting

Minutes

Present: O. Ghrayeb (SVP, Undergraduate Education), R. Caughron (BC, Chair), A. Schatteman (BC), M. Myles (BC), J. Pendergrass (BUS), P. Smith (EDU), R. Sinko (EET), M. Cooke (HHS), S. Sharp (LAS/SS), L. Sunderlin (LAS/NS), C. Abreu (LAS/H), B. Broom (VPA), S. Estes (Director Academic Advising, LAS), K. Robinson (LAS, Student), J. Lung (LAS, Student), R. Subramony (AVP Academic Assessment), C. Zack (Academic Assessment), D. Halverson (CC/CE)

The meeting was called to order by Rod Caughron, Chair.

I. Adoption of Agenda: Caughron called for a motion to adopt the agenda. Estes so moved and this was seconded by Myles with no discussion; the motion was APPROVED unanimously.

II. Announcements: None

III. New Business:

A. Foundational Studies Quantitative Literacy Requirement clarifying text – Presented by Estes. Caughron called for a motion to discuss and vote on this issue. Sharp so moved, and this was seconded by Myles.

Stat 300; STAT 100; MATH 110; MATH 104/105; and IYSE 335 will not meet the foundational studies quantitative literacy requirement without addition courses as clarified in the requirement section of the General Education page in the catalog.

This proposal intends to clarify this with an * notation on these course in the Foundational Studies Course Descriptions list on the same page. The language would be as follows: This course will not meet the Foundational Studies Quantitative Literacy Requirement without additional course requirements being met. Please see the Foundational Studies Quantitative Literacy Requirement section for details on the other courses needed to satisfy the requirement when taking this course.

Caughron called the vote and it was APPROVED unanimously.

IV. Old Business:

Ongoing discussion of the General Education mission and philosophy as it relates to an assessment model. Zack from Academic Assessment presented a model comparison of two assessment strategies. One model was a high faculty engagement model and the other a low faculty engagement model. A pros and cons discussion ensued with committee agreement that a blended model might have benefits at NIU.
Several members of the committee expressed concern that faculty did not currently have the level of knowledge about assessment to engage in a blended model. Ghrayeb and Subramony jointly discussed opportunities for professional development as part of a new assessment model. Assessment re-organization is occurring in many units across the University and therefore faculty will have multiple opportunities for development on this issue.

Members of the Assessment Sub-Committee discussed the process for investigating the student-learning-outcomes as they relate to assessment. The sub-committee work will continue and more will be presented at the next meeting.

V. **Adjournment** – Caughron called for a motion to adjourn at 1:45 pm. Pendergrass so moved and Estes seconded; the motion was **APPROVED unanimously**.

Respectfully submitted by Denise Halverson, Curriculum Coordinator/ Catalog Editor.