

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. [LINK](#)

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.