

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

April 21, 2022
Meeting 7
12:30 – 3:00 p.m.

Teams Virtual Meeting

Minutes

Voting Members Present: R. Caughron (BC, Chair), A. Schatteman (BC), S. Ehsani (BC),
A. Setterstrom (BUS), J. Tan (EET), M. Cooke (HHS), S. Sharp (LAS/SS), S. Estes
(Director Academic Advising, LAS), A. Navarrete (LAS, Student)

Ex Officio Members Present: O. Ghrayeb (Senior Vice Provost), R. Subramony (Director, Academic
Assessment), C. Zack (Academic Assessment), C. McFarland McKee (CC/CE)

I. Meeting Call to Order by Chair, Rod Caughron

The meeting was called to order at 12:31 p.m.

II. Adoption of Agenda

Caughron called for a motion to adopt the agenda. Estes so moved and this was seconded by Setterstrom. The motion to adopt was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**.

III. Minutes from 03.24.2022 are approved and in Teams for review.

IV. Announcements

- A. This meeting on April 21, 2022, is the final meeting of the General Education Committee for the academic year 2021-22.
- B. Returning members for the academic year 2022-23 are: Andy Setterstrom, Marcia Cooke, Shane Sharp, and Christina Abreu.

V. New Business

- A. Pathways Revision Proposal Status Update was given by Ghrayeb, who reported that he had shared the recommendation that came from the GEC with Provost Ingram and the Curricular Deans.

Ghrayeb also reported that his counterpart at Illinois State University had contacted him and shared that ISU was considering following NIU's footsteps and creating pathways. She said that however, for many of their programs, there was not much room in the curriculum for students to take additional courses and asked how NIU handled that challenge. The ISU Vice Provost also noted that she had heard that NIU was reviewing our pathways. Ghrayeb shared that yes, we are reviewing our pathways for the same exact reasons that she was citing, in that we have many programs as well in which students do not have the luxury to complete the pathway within their general education. She also cited that ISU has many programs where the curriculum double dips between the coursework required for the program and general education requirements. Ghrayeb noted that is also the case at NIU where we have many programs as well where a specific general education course or courses are required for the program as well. Ghrayeb explained that his reason for sharing this conversation was to highlight that the challenges we face at NIU in implementing the pathways are

not unique to us.

Ghrayeb reminded everyone who was not a part of the GEC when they reviewed the pathways, that the GEC conducted a very thorough and deep analysis of how many students took the pathways, how many students tried or took some courses into pathways, how many students completed the pathways, how many students completed two out of the three in a given pathway, and what are the most popular pathways. Ghrayeb commented that the GEC spent a whole year doing that data mining and analysis, a very thorough job, and thanked the members who were involved.

Ghrayeb then shared that the top question he received when he gave the update for the recommendation of the GEC on pathways was, "What are we benefiting from deleting the pathways?" Ghrayeb's response was that we have pathways in the catalog that are not used or active in a way that we had hoped, so we are cleaning up the catalog. He explained that the benefit in deleting them is that we will have a more organized catalog and general education program. Ghrayeb reported that the conclusion in his meeting with the Provost was to go ahead with the recommendation of the GEC to delete the four pathways that the GEC recommended, keep the three pathways, and work on strengthening and streamlining those three pathways, making sure that the entire campus know about them and that students who can take advantage of them should do so. Ghrayeb noted that the three pathways that are recommended by the GEC are in alignment with strategic enrollment management and the mission and vision of the institution, and he does not foresee anyone saying no to any of the three pathways.

Operationalizing the pathway changes is a different subject, per Ghrayeb. The next step is to start reviewing the courses included under each pathway and ensure that these courses are sufficiently coherent and fulfill the merit and the spirit of that given pathway. That is needed and it is important to create a communication plan to ensure that all faculty members and all units that have courses in each of these pathways know that they have courses in these pathways and know the other courses in that pathway. Having faculty members somehow coordinate these courses would be important, and when we come to that step the GEC definitely will be involved. Ghrayeb shared his perspective that we don't have to have 20 courses under each pathway. Even if we reduce the courses to ten or even less that are meaningful and students, when they take these courses, see the concentration and feel the deep learning under that pathway, we will be more successful.

Ghrayeb summarized the update by noting that we have not executed the recommendation yet, but hopefully in the fall we will delete the four pathways from the catalog and will start operationalizing the recommendation.

Caughron noted that the process was an entire year, and thanked Ed Klonoski, who was Assistant Vice Provost during that time, and worked with Caughron in reviewing with the departments and supervisors of the different programs and different pathways. Caughron also thanked Sharp, who did some excellent research, and Schatteman, who also served on the committee. Caughron shared that it was a busy year that took a lot of time and effort, and they came up with a solution that is workable if we are going to maintain the pathways.

Sharp commented that in keeping the pathways, there might be a conflict with our other agenda of paring down some of the other general education courses to be 200-level or lower or to have no prerequisites, because a lot of the pathways are dependent on 300- or 400-level courses that do have prerequisites. Sharp noted that he did not have a solution but that this is something that will have to be considered going forward.

Ghrayeb agreed and reminded the members that a course first must be a general

education course, so it must meet whatever recommendations this committee has for the criteria for general education courses. Second, Ghrayeb noted that once a course is approved as a general education course, then it may or may not qualify to be in a given pathway.

Subramony asked that the three pathways that will be kept be reiterated for those who may or may not have been part of the earlier conversations. Caughron and Ghrayeb noted that three pathways are Health and Wellness; Social Justice and Diversity; and Sustainability. Caughron added that those three were chosen because 1) they did have students who were active in them, with Health and Wellness at number one, and 2) they also aligned with the university strategic plans. Ghrayeb and Caughron added that these were in the top four most popular pathways.

- B. Caughron called for a motion to amend the agenda to add MATH 103. Estes so moved, second by Satterstrom, to amend the agenda. Ghrayeb presented the curricular item, which is a part of the re-design of developmental education in English, Math, and Literacy. We had two remedial courses, MATH 108 and MATH 109, some students would be placed in MATH 108 and then had to pass both MATH 108 and MATH 109, and then move to MATH 110, which is the first college-level course. The vision, which is a mandate by the State, is to re-think developmental education where all students start at a college-level course. The remedial courses are credit-bearing but do not count toward anything, whereas the college-level courses are credit-bearing but also count toward something in the program. Math Department already developed and approved a new course that is in the catalog to replace MATH 109. MATH 108 is the last course to be replaced and the Math Department proposed a new course, MATH 103. Passing MATH 103 would be equivalent to passing MATH 101, which already meets the Foundational Studies Quantitative Literacy requirement. This means MATH 103 in contents and outcome is equivalent to MATH 101. Ghrayeb requested a motion to the GEC to approve MATH 103 to be included on the list of courses that fulfill Quantitative Reasoning. Estes so moved and this was seconded by Setterstrom. The motion was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**.

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences CLAS 08 (AY 2021-2022)

- Item CLAS21.22.08.01/ Add MATH 103 to Gen Ed FSQLR

VI. Old Business

- A. Report from the Assessment Sub-Committee. Next steps for syllabus statement that GEC passed on 03.24.2022 will be discussed as well as assessment methods. Placement of these on the [General Education Web Pages](#) and the [application](#) will need to be determined. The application changes discussed at the 02.17.2022 meeting are not reflected on the application currently. All the tasks need to be provided at one time given DoIt workload. For a summary of these tasks, see GEC minutes from 01.20.2022 (in Teams).

Caughron reported that for the most part, the Assessment Sub-Committee was created two years ago and consists of Schatteman, Sharp, and Caughron. It was kept going to set up a proposal and approval at this meeting for Ritu Subramony to go through with this process. Caughron shared that Schatteman, as a department chair, had brought up the point that chairs do not even know what is going on with the assessment process, and that GEC has to educate them first on what to do in order for the assessment to work. Caughron reported that the Assessment Sub-Committee decided that during the summer we would have a roadshow again. Last year, Subramony and Caughron had the assessment roadshow in which they met with about every committee on campus and explained the assessment process. Now what we need to do is go down to the people

who are going to implement the process and give them an idea of where the GEC is going to go with the process, so that in the fall we will be able to actually start the process of assessment. Caughron noted that we do not know exactly what that will look like, whether a video will be created discussing the process or will meet directly with people as groups and college senates.

Ghrayeb noted that he hoped the GEC did not get the impression that this assessment is not a priority because we did not work on it this semester. It is a priority and given that there are so many moving parts, we have to prioritize where we invest our limited time. The SEM Plan, as you know, was a priority so we had to complete that and our focus was on the SEM Plan. Streamlining general education is a priority that is impacting our students and has impacted our bottom line in terms of resources. Ghrayeb asked that members not misunderstand what he was saying as any intention to cancel courses, but affirmed that the intention, again, is to make sure that the learning outcomes of the particular courses align with the learning outcomes intended for each of our knowledge domains for our students so that we fulfill the premise of general education. Ghrayeb concluded that this is what we will be working on.

Caughron pointed out that one of things that we often don't take into consideration, especially in an organization as big as the university, is the inertia of getting change. With a large constituency in this process not completely informed of what is happening, GEC really needs to do our work beforehand, and then move forward. It would be better to do it right and slowly, rather than quickly and messed up, similar to what happened with the pathways, which essentially did not work.

Subramony, Director of Academic Assessment, presented her thoughts on the assessment process at this point. She started by sharing the spreadsheet created and uploaded earlier by Sharp titled "Spring 2022 Gen Ed wPRQ_CRQ" and then shared her document "Gen Ed course assessment-proposal 04-2022" with GEC members. Subramony explained that we were looking at the three Gen Ed knowledge domains to see how the courses were going to align. We had the student learning outcomes and a pyramid saying that each knowledge domain can have two of these learning outcomes; one needs to be a primary and one needs to be a secondary. In anecdotal evidence, we heard that in some cases that was not aligning well. Some people, like in ETRA, reported that in looking at their courses, the primary and secondary outcomes were not working and some tweaking was needed as to which SLOs go under each knowledge domain.

Subramony reported that we all understand that streamlining gen ed is going to be a priority and the assessment has to follow, and shared a page from her assessment proposal titled "General Education Program Evaluation: Logic Model" which she noted is a document she would typically use that includes a visual representation of the assumptions and theory of action that underlies the structure of the program to be evaluated. The bigger question is to get the whole program streamlined, and making sense of what are the things that need to be done to have a complete program, and then evaluate different parts of it: how many courses are in the program and what is being delivered. Assessment becomes a part of that evaluation with the focus on Student Learning Outcomes. Subramony indicated that that is where her unit would come in.

Subramony explained that she would need to have an inventory of gen ed courses that are going to be offered by sections either in summer and/or fall and next spring, and in looking at the spreadsheet that Sharp had uploaded, it showed what kind of courses were being offered. Subramony noted that she was able to see the number of courses being offered in the three domains and could see that each of those courses were aligning to some student outcomes.

Subramony then proposed that GEC take stock either in summer or fall where we see which courses are being offered and reach out to the courses and solicit whoever is able to give us any data for their SLOs for gen ed. We ensure that the instructor is very intentional about the gen ed course so that the course language we discussed is going to be instituted in the syllabus and it is very clear that this is a gen ed course that is covering these two student outcomes. Once that is clear we ask the department chair/faculty instructor to give us any evidence of how they are assessing their gen ed course, how they are looking at the two learning outcomes that courses align to. Subramony shared that in her proposal she wants to keep it high level because right now getting into rubrics or something similar is probably not going to make sense across the board. She noted that some people are already doing assessment, so we simply just ask them to give us whatever they have for their gen ed course, whether it is a survey, a rubric, or their overall sense of how they are doing, and understand that all kinds of methods are going to come in, but at least it will give us something.

When that information comes in, Subramony noted, her office will have the opportunity to start aggregating that data for the GEC. The GEC members can then weigh on it to what methods do and do not make sense, and what else can we give in terms of feedback, so we can give feedback to the courses that are giving us information. We can also inform our next steps. Subramony suggested that the information should come into the gen ed mailbox and not her office. She also noted that if an instructor is teaching multiple gen ed courses, we do not need to give the extra work to that instructor of giving information on all of them, but to just give information on any one course.

Subramony explained that we can have a rotation basis. We can focus on particular knowledge domains, or we can focus on particular student learning outcomes. Knowledge domains right now, per Subramony, is tricky because that alignment is not completely clear. We can still go that way, or we can just contact everyone who is teaching a gen ed course and can give us something, knowing full well that some people may not be the first time. Or we could focus on a particular SLO, or randomly pull some courses and see if they will do it. Subramony shared that it doesn't matter to her which approach is used, but if they can get some data on the gen ed courses, it will allow her office to aggregate some of the data and then have discussions about where to go next, and the process that is developed will be more deliberate and sequential. This is the time, Subramony noted, that she needs something. She can propel the process forward in terms of the assessment in a parallel process to streamlining the program.

Ghrayeb thanked Subramony for the report and clarified that her office needs data for our HLC Report so it is a must that we collect data. He pointed out that in addition to looking at this assessment as a pilot, Subramony needs data that is presentable to HLC. Ghrayeb recommended we begin with the fall (2022) semester given the short timeframe and that the plan will need to be explained to people through communication during the summer. We already know which courses will be offered in the fall under general education. Ghrayeb suggested that we capture all of the courses offered under each knowledge domain in the fall semester and focus on a knowledge domain. Under each knowledge domain, let's pick ten courses and have these courses, in terms of load, distributed so that not all of them are from one department or the same faculty member so we don't burden any one unit. Instead of asking open questions like tell us how you are assessing your two outcomes, these two outcomes that are supposed to map to that course because it is under this knowledge domain may not be the case. First we need to visit with those people and say your course under this knowledge domain, according to the new criteria, is supposed to be mapped to these two or three core outcomes. Or we can do the legwork and check in our files and see which outcomes were identified when this course was submitted. Ghrayeb recommended that we start with the courses where there are no discrepancies in the

two of the three outcomes mentioned when they submitted the course. Once we have identified these courses, we know which courses we want to collect data. We need to not make it overwhelming, but instead of asking open questions, ask them to tell us how they are assessing these two outcomes in their course. Ghrayeb suggested that we need to give more information about what assessment tools they can use or would be recommended for them to use. When the data comes to Subramony's office, they will want useful data for HLC, so we can ask for one direct measure and one indirect measure. We can provide them with an exhaustive list of examples of direct measures, and let them choose which tool under direct they want to use, but it has to be a direct measure. We need another tool that is indirect, and we give them examples of indirect measure options for them to choose. Ghrayeb suggested we might start with a mass email to chairs of all units that teach those courses that we have identified, and then we follow up with meetings with those chairs to explain or answer any questions they might have.

Subramony noted that she would take any data that she could get for a baseline, but she liked the suggestions of Ghrayeb that if we could provide a little more direction it would be better.

Ghrayeb noted that he was going to make a recommendation to the Provost that he would like to have two members of the GEC who have interest and expertise in assessment to be compensated for one month in the summer to be working together and helping Subramony's office in creating all of the materials and begin the analysis. Ghrayeb added that he thought that would be helpful and if any GEC members are interested to please let him know.

Schatteman shared that in looking at her department's course NNGO 100, it is listed in the Society and Culture Knowledge Domain, and when they submitted the course in the application, they selected learning goals A and C. A is about writing and speaking, and C is about interconnection of various interdisciplines. Schatteman noted that they had never assessed specifically those learning goals, which are now kind of embedded but are not explicit in the syllabi for the Gen Ed course. Schatteman pointed out that they have never really assessed Gen Ed learning outcomes before. She can provide the syllabus, but those Gen Ed learning outcomes won't be there, and she can provide the assessments done in the class, but they are not tied to specific Gen Ed learning outcomes.

Subramony pointed out that one of the questions is whether faculty and instructors know that a course is a Gen Ed course. People are on a continuum, and she is already getting a sense of that as she is talking to people. Subramony also shared that her office has had questions about if units are being asked to provide data, what is going to happen with that data? She stressed that it needs to be clarified that this is for student learning outcomes and the data is going to be aggregated and analyzed to make sense of what kind of feedback can be given back to units, and down the road it helps us to see how our program is. Gathering the data is not about individual instructors, although units may get feedback on changing your assessment or that kind of thing.

Schatteman suggested that the first step of the assessment could be done with the willing and ask that the learning outcomes be included in the syllabus for fall, and assess those learning outcomes during the fall. We would have to wait until the end of the fall semester to get data, rather than asking units to give us what they have right now. Schatteman said she would volunteer to do this with NNGO 100 but just cannot give anything right now.

Ghrayeb affirmed that this is why he did not want to ask open-ended questions and ask that they give us what they have, because what they have may not be useful to HLC.

That is why we need to be more specific, by saying that your course aligns with these two outcomes, tell us how you are going to assess these outcomes, and we want one direct major data point and one indirect. You have these choices of direct and indirect. Pick one in each category, assess your students, and give us your assessment data by the end of the semester. It's that simple and straightforward.

Sharp suggested that another approach may be to contact those that teach Gen Ed courses and ask them to submit their syllabus and sample assignments. We already know what their social learning outcomes are supposed to be, and we could look at what they provide and see whether those assignments map onto those social learning outcomes. That data would not be hard to get.

Subramony noted that this approach sounds simple enough and might work in some cases, but what if the student learning outcomes for which the data is needed are not aligned? Subramony reiterated Ghrayeb's suggestion to instead make sure that the expectations are clear, and that alignment has happened before the data is collected. We can still ask them to submit a couple of their sample assignments, but we have to ensure that the student learning outcomes and the course are actually aligning.

Sharp asked if we want to collect data to make sure that the assignments are aligning or to just describe and see? If we get assignments and they do not in any way seem to align with social learning outcomes, that's a finding and therefore that is something that would tell us that we need to do something to more or less enforce that they teach these student learning outcomes.

Ghrayeb commented that we will start with the courses that are already mapped to two of the three outcomes in that knowledge domain so there is no question there that they are not mapped. We are going to be telling the units or departments beforehand that their course is supposed to support these two or three general education outcomes. There is content in each course that's related to that learning outcome, and we are not interfering in the content or looking at the content at this point. All that we will doing is noting that your course supports these two learning outcomes and asking that they tell us how they assess students' attainment of these outcomes, and we want them to use one direct measure and one indirect. To dive deeper into an example of assignments, an assignment can have five questions, but not all five questions are measuring students' attainment of that outcome, maybe just one or two of the five. For a faculty member to give us an assignment that has five questions requires us to be a subject matter expert to identify which question of the five relates to that outcome. That is why we want the faculty member to decide which question asked on the assignment really measures student attainment of that specific outcome. When we design the form, we will have open-ended questions, in addition to the data that the faculty member will submit, which will be useful for General Education and for HLC. We will ask the faculty member to give us their overall assessment of students' attainment and give us corrective action if you are not fully satisfied with students' attainment of the outcomes. We are not penalizing or punishing any course if the data shows that the students are not attaining the outcomes. Just tell us what corrective action you will make and implement next cycle so that students do attain the outcomes. Subject matter experts' opinion and feedback would be part of our assessment as well.

Schatteman pointed out that when departments applied for Gen Ed for courses, they could pick any learning outcomes they wanted. They didn't pick a domain, just any two of three outcomes, so the existing courses won't specifically align with the new categorization, so we are going to need to do that piece as well. Department faculty and chairs will need to decide if their courses should stay in the same domain and re-select the new outcomes so that they can embed those outcomes in their syllabus for fall. So there are a couple of steps before we ask existing courses to participate.

Ghrayeb agreed and noted that is why hopefully we will find enough courses that already map, and if we don't find enough courses in each knowledge domain, unfortunately we will need to do exactly what Schatteman described.

Subramony noted that there is no way to know if we are going to find enough courses, and that is a question that perhaps should come from the GEC. Ghrayeb noted that we do have that data in the Excel spreadsheet that Sharp had prepared and that Subramony had shown. Subramony summarized her understanding that the spreadsheet reflects the SLOs that were aligned to a particular knowledge domain by course when the course applied to be a Gen Ed course but at that point, there was not as much detail or thought given to which particular SLOs really aligned.

Ghrayeb pointed out that if that was the case, that there was not much thought given or intentionality in picking outcomes that relate to the content of the course, then we may be in deeper trouble than we thought and will be more work on the department. We are not going to start with those courses that do not align with the outcomes that were claimed. For our current purposes, we are going to start with the courses that the claimed outcomes align with what outcomes we decide for each. There will be meetings and additional communications, and if they come back to us and say the outcomes don't really align, they can re-submit. Ghrayeb advocated that GEC proceed step-by-step and go ahead with the plan and if a department comes back and says they are not addressing the outcomes identified when the course was submitted, then we talk further.

Schatteman clarified that when departments submitted, they did not have two specific learning outcomes in each domain, and that is the issue. Perhaps only one of the learning outcomes is now in that knowledge domain, and the other outcome is in another domain. The intention when they were chosen was good but now that we are reorganizing the domains, the outcomes chosen may no longer be in that domain, so departments now need to decide do they want to keep the learning outcomes and switch domains, or realign the learning outcomes to stay in the initial domain.

Subramony asked if we are then able to look at courses at the SLO level if the learning outcomes are more accurate right now than the knowledge domain alignment. We may well find that courses are very aligned to their learning outcomes and are fine. It is just a matter of aligning to the domain, which is less of a problem than aligning to the right SLOs in a domain. Subramony suggested that we start by collecting data at the SLO level in the fall. We can still randomly sample across all of the seven SLOs.

Caughron explained that the proposed informational roadshow during the summer would essentially introduce the three domains that their Gen Ed courses have to fit in, and then the rules and SLOs for each domain. Once they know that, they can start looking at their Gen Ed courses to re-align them all during the summer and bring them to the first meeting of the GEC in the fall. Once they are aligned, then we can go ahead and easily do a stratified random sample of just one domain, or all three. If we do this approach, Caughron noted that everything is already aligned to the three domains and the SLOs, and then all that will Subramony's office will need to do is pick courses within each of the domains. Caughron noted that this is possible because the departments are going to have to realign to the three domains and their SLOs eventually if they want to keep their courses in the Gen Ed program. Caughron stated that during the summer, this can be effectively done by going to the faculty senates of each college, explaining exactly what the chairs need to do, and if the chairs have any questions after that meeting, they can contact whoever is involved in or in charge of this process. This is possible, per Caughron, because most departments do not have that many Gen Eds, and when it is distributed through the departments, the

departments can handle that work over the summer. If we do that and insist that departments have the courses submitted by the first Gen Ed Committee meeting, the first meeting will be a heavy load to look at every course and ensure that they are in alignment but will make the process easier after that. Caughron opined that every course must get into our three-domain system first.

Ghrayeb suggested that next step is to capture all of the general education courses that we are offering in the fall, and Registration & Records can help with that. Step two, go back to the files and capture all the outcomes that the departments selected when they submitted their courses. Step three, let's cross-list these outcomes to the newly approved outcomes for each knowledge domain and identify the courses that already align.

Subramony asked for clarification on how we would do that, providing an example in which she was notified by someone that their course does not align with the outcomes and domain reflected on the books. The issue is that she needs someone to tell her office whether a course aligns or does not align with the outcomes and the knowledge domain. Ghrayeb clarified that we should identify the courses that on the records align, according to what was submitted with the course application. What they do in reality we will discover. We focus on these courses that align, and hopefully we will have enough courses under each knowledge domain that already align. The next step would be to communicate with those departments and let them know that their Gen Ed course is being offered in the fall and has been selected to assess data; their course aligns to these 2 or 3 outcomes and this specific knowledge domain; we want them to do assessment using one direct data point and one indirect data point; and submit their data. Potential responses from that request are yes, we will do that, and they may have questions about tools to use, etc., and we can help them with that. Another possible response is "no, actually we are not teaching to these outcomes." In that case, we will not proceed with that course. We give them a pass for this offering but by the first meeting of the GEC in the fall, they need to resubmit their course, and if they are going to resubmit their course in the same knowledge domain, these are the three outcomes it must map to. If by the deadline of the first meeting of the GEC in the fall they do not resubmit, their course will be tagged as a non-General Education course because it is no longer approved. For the pool of courses pre-identified that do not align, we are following the process described by Caughron. We notify them that their course is in this knowledge domain, these are the outcomes for this knowledge domain, and ask them to please re-align their course or pick another knowledge domain as they see fit and re-submit. We give them a deadline beyond the first GEC meeting in the fall because it is more work.

Subramony clarified that there are seven (7) new student learning outcomes, but #5 has an "a" and "b".

Caughron noted that in terms of the Gen Ed courses themselves and for assessment to be successful, we have to be on the same page with everybody aligned to the three domains and then the SLOs within those three domains. Once we get that, Caughron noted, assessment will be easy because everyone will know what is expected. In the roadshow this summer, Ghrayeb and Caughron can give the academic side and propose the deadlines, and then Subramony can describe what her office needs from them as they move forward, so they will keep in mind the types of data to collect. Once everyone is on the same page, we can simply say these are the courses being assessed, collect your data and send it to us at the end of the semester, and if you have questions let us know. Caughron stressed again his opinion that we cannot move forward without everyone being aligned to the three domains.

Caughron summarized the discussion, reminding GEC that this has been a two-year

process, and noted that he, Ghrayeb and Subramony will probably have to meet again in May, and if there is another GEC member that would like to participate, to let Omar know. It will take at least six meetings of perhaps a couple of hours each with the College Senates to explain this process, but Caughron noted he thought by the end of summer it could be all done.

- B. No conversation occurred on the 300/400 level courses and PRQ/CRQ courses. This item had been tabled from 03.24.2022 meeting. Ghrayeb suggested this agenda item again be tabled as we look at the courses. Spring 2022 General Education Excel with PRQ data included is available in Teams.
- C. Caughron noted that this agenda item “larger assessment framework discussion continuation as determined by committee” was incorporated into Item VI.A.
- D. Caughron noted that this was his last meeting as GEC Chair, and thanked various members of the GEC for their support and assistance during his chairmanship.

VII. Adjournment

Caughron called for a motion to adjourn. Cooke so moved and this was seconded by Sharp. The motion was **APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY**. The meeting was adjourned at 1:47 pm.

This was the last meeting of the General Education Committee for AY 2021-2022 on Teams. The next meeting of the General Education Committee for AY 2022-2023 is scheduled for Thursday, September 15, 2022, at a time and location to be determined.