

**General Education Committee  
Minutes  
April 23, 2018**

Present: Lori Gray, Jeff Dippmann, Morgan Bliss, Becky Pearson, John Bowen, Jim Johnson, Thomas Tenerelli, Melissa Becker, Jill Hoxmeier, Laurie Moshier, Holly Pinkart, Stephanie Hubbard, Cody Stoddard

Absent: Lizzie Brown

Guest(s): None

Meeting was called to order 3:04 p.m.

Jim moved to approve the April 16, 2018 minutes. Holly seconded, and motion was approved.

Chair updates – Becky met with Eric Cheney this past week to discuss what the GEC is doing as information to the GEITF.

Lori asked if the committee has decided what we want on the pathway coordinator and/or knowledge area coordinators.

The committee broke into subgroups to work on draft policy language.

Group #1 - Melissa reported for this group. This group was working on policies for the program. General statement that the program is owned and driven by the faculty for the benefit of the students. Talked about the goals that were driving the program. Program should be flexible, but to make changes the individual would need to provide the nature of changes, supporting data, benefits of change, impact analysis and potential costs, data or supportive evidence, implementation plan and timing of that plan and how would the assessment work. Definition of program would be guiding philosophy, goals, rules and outcomes will be in policy.

Group #2 - John reported for this group. The group reviewed how the process worked this past year. Things worked okay with Curriculog worked. Proposers did not provide information they were supposed to. See useful of pathway coordinators to review the proposal to make sure the information is correct. Maybe have workshops for proposers throughout year. The coordinator would just be a consultant on how to put a proposal together for the committee. Course proposals would need to be in early in October to meet the curriculum program change deadlines. Proposals are reviewed for adherence for GE rules and outcomes. Lay out very clearly where the information needs to be. Morgan suggested give a good proposals example in the guidelines.

Group #3 - Jim reported for this group. Looked at policy/procedure, Senate Bylaws and Senate Faculty Code. Start from individual faculty and work with pathway coordinator. Pathway coordinator may need to be part of the committee. Didn't feel there needed to be a knowledge area coordinator. The group will be working on the student petition language. There should be workload added if the committee is going to be pathway coordinators. Three categories of petitions (transfer students with completed DTA, transfer students without complete DTA, on native students). All petitions should be evaluated by Registrar and anything questionable comes to the committee. Committee decision is final.

Group #4 - Jeff reported for this group. The group reviewed program assessment from Oakland university. Jeff will send this to Janet for committee dissemination. Associate Provost would be doing

student assessment, this committee would work on course assessment. Knowledge area assessments on a three-year rotation. 12 categories or knowledge areas. Divide up so many every year. Six-year course evaluation with a program review on every 7 years. Should this be the GE committee responsibility or create an interrelated committee like a GE council that would do this and report back to this committee. The committee talked about a week-long institute during the summer that faculty would be paid for doing this. Also assess at a macro level, are there enough staffing, facilities, courses being offered. How many courses will be offered each year? Assess are the courses meeting the outcomes and are they meeting what we want in GE?. Do we need a student layer evaluation as well, SEOI type questions or some type of student feedback?

Groups will come next week with draft language to start working as a group.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.