General Education Committee (GEC)
Minutes: Monday, September 19, 2016, 4 pm
Old Main 106

SCOPE: GEC is responsible for providing quality and oversight of all of the General Education courses offered at SUU, and it is expected to ensure compliance with state-mandated policies on General Education and alignment with SUU's strategic and academic plans.

GEC RESPONSIBILITIES*

1. Work with faculty, staff, and students to ensure SUU offers and maintains a comprehensive, assessable, and dynamic general education program that meets the agreed upon institutional learning outcomes and goals.

2. Develop and coordinate the GEC's operation in cooperation with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC)

3. Provide oversight of the General Education courses offered at SUU.

4. Work with the Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning (CETL) to help support faculty teaching effectiveness in general education courses.

**See SUU Policy 6.8.3 for additional details about the GE Committee*

To be approved at the October 10, 2016 GE meeting

Present: John Belk, Anne Diekema, Jon Karpel, Cynthia Kimball Davis, Adam Lambert, Leilani Nautu, Michael Ostrowsky, Josh Price, James Sage, Emma Schafer, Madalyn Swanson, John Taylor, & Bonny Rayburn.

I. Call to Order

- Meeting called to order at 4:08 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of prior GE Committee meeting minutes (May 2, 2016, in Canvas)

- Minutes approved unanimously

III. Announcements

A. GE Committee membership: Welcome new members!

- Introductions

B. "What's An Educated Person?" conference (October 27-28, Midway, UT)

- Additional information posted on canvas
- If any new committee members would like to attend, please contact James before the end of the month. Registration fee goes up after that.
- Associate Provost's Office will reimburse for registration fee, room, meals, and will provide a university vehicle for group transportation.

C. Regent's GE Task Force

- John Taylor provided a few updates
- R470 approved by Board of Regents with revisions. Posted on Canvas FYI.

IV. Discussion Items

A. GE Assessment Results: Dashboards now available on mySUU portal:

https://my.suu.edu/dashboard
James provided a brief review of the 5-year Assessment cycle and the 3-year Curriculum review cycle.

B. GE Academy: August 15 (feedback) and Fall Semester

- We will need to schedule one or two additional GE Academies during fall semester; may need to break the workshop into two 2-hour blocks. Will work with the GE Resources workgroup to make arrangements. Collaborate with CETL to post GE-related workshop resources on their page.

C. GE Town Hall: In light of the new university strategic plan, it may be a good idea for the GE Committee to engage the campus in conversations about the value of GE at SUU. The GE Town Hall idea (format) might be a good way to facilitate this conversation.

D. GE Committee "Workgroups" – brief review of core functions and update workgroup membership:

1. **GE Curriculum Management Workgroup**
   Johnny MacLean (Chair)
   Michael Ostrowsky
   John Allred
   Emma Schafer
   Jon Karpel
2. **GE Assessment Workgroup**
   James Sage
   John Taylor
   Leilani Nautu
   Josh Price
   Christian Reiner
   Johnny MacLean
   John Belk
3. **GE Resources Workgroup**
   John Meisner
   Cynthia Kimball-Davis
   Madalyn Swanson
   Anne Diekema
   Adam Lambert

V. Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Information Items:

Fall 2016 Meeting Schedule:

- Monday, September 19 from 4:00-5:30 pm in OM 106
- Monday, October 10 from 4:00-5:30 pm in OM 106
- Monday, October 31 from 4:00-5:30 pm in OM 106 (we will try to end early)
- Monday, November 28 from 4:00-5:30 pm in OM 106
- Meetings of the subcommittee work groups to be determined by subcommittees

DRAFT

General Education Committee (GEC)

MINUTES: Monday, October 10, 2016, 4 pm
Old Main 106

SCOPE: GEC is responsible for providing quality and oversight of all of the General Education courses offered at SUU, and it is expected to ensure compliance with state-mandated policies on General Education and alignment with SUU's strategic and academic plans.

GEC RESPONSIBILITIES*

1. Work with faculty, staff, and students to ensure SUU offers and maintains a comprehensive, assessable, and dynamic general education program that meets the agreed upon institutional learning outcomes and goals.
2. Develop and coordinate the GEC's operation in cooperation with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC)
3. Provide oversight of the General Education courses offered at SUU.
4. Work with the Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning (CETL) to help support faculty teaching effectiveness in general education courses.

**See SUU Policy 6.8.3 for additional details about the GE Committee*

To be approved at the October 31, 2016 GE meeting

Present: John Allred, John Belk, Anne Diekema, Jon Karpel, Keith Bradshaw for Adam Lambert, Leilani Nautu, Michael Ostrowsky, Josh Price, Christian Reiner, James Sage, Emma Schafer, Madalyn Swanson, John Taylor, and Bonny Rayburn.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

a. Approval of prior GE Committee meeting minutes (September 19, 2016, in Canvas)
- Approved unanimously

III. Announcements

a. "What's An Educated Person?" conference (October 27-28, Midway, UT)
- John Taylor will be taking a group (Andy Marvick, Michael Bahr, and 2 Jumpstart students. Cynthia Kimball Davis, Matt Wegg, and James Sage will also be attending.
- Past deadline for discounted rate but let James know if you would like to attend.

IV. Discussion Items

a. **GE Committee "Workgroups"**

i. GE Curriculum Management Workgroup
- GE Curriculum Review message was distributed to Department Chairs (copy posted in Canvas)
- Workgroup meeting scheduled for October 27 @ 9 am to review submissions
- Results will be presented/discussed at the October 31 meeting
- On the radar: GE course proposal procedures for *new* GE designations

ii. GE Assessment Workgroup – Christian Reiner
- Christian Reiner provided an overview of GE Assessment Results that are now available in a Dashboard on the mySUU portal: https://my.suu.edu/dashboard
- Christian also uploaded all GE Assessment Data into TracDat. An overview of TracDat and its main components was provided.

- The committee discussed the need to add to provide complete information in TracDat, especially "Action and Follow-Up"
    - This will help us to be prepared for the NWCCU 2017 Mid-Cycle Review.
- Discussion of the need to develop an over-arching GE Assessment Plan; such a plan will help to guide our decision-making with respect to areas of focus for professional development, revisions to the curriculum, and establishing targets (benchmarks)
- On the radar: discussion of ELO assignments for Knowledge Areas, expectations for ELO reporting in Canvas, triangulation with institutional measures, development of mid-level assessment efforts (signature work and/or e-portfolios)
    - Long discussion on setting targets for: (i) participation rates, and (ii) achievement of learning outcomes; also, the need to engage faculty in professional development aimed at "calibration" or "norming" (with respect to the 1,2,3,4 rubric values.
    - Discussion regarding which ELOs to assess this year. General consensus emerged that we should stick to the three ELOs that are next on the schedule. For this year (2016-2017), that would be: Digital Literacy, Information Literacy, and Inquiry/Analysis. There was also discussion of the Quantitative Literacy ELO (to be included based on the existing (ongoing) efforts within the Department of Mathematics).

iii. GE Resources Workgroup

- Need to schedule additional "GE Academy" sessions during Fall semester (repeat of August)

V. Request to reschedule October 31st meeting.

- James will send out doodle poll in Canvas with alternative dates and times.

VI. **Adjourn**

- Meeting was adjourned at 5:36 p.m.

General Education Committee (GEC)

Minutes: Monday, October 31, 2016, 3:30 pm
Old Main 106

COMMITTEE CHARGE

SCOPE: GEC is responsible for providing quality and oversight of all of the General Education courses offered at SUU, and it is expected to ensure compliance with state-mandated policies on General Education and alignment with SUU's strategic and academic plans.

GEC RESPONSIBILITIES*

1. Work with faculty, staff, and students to ensure SUU offers and maintains a comprehensive, assessable, and dynamic general education program that meets the agreed upon institutional learning outcomes and goals
2. Develop and coordinate the GEC's operation in cooperation with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC)
3. Provide oversight of the General Education courses offered at SUU.
4. Work with the Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning (CETL) to help support faculty teaching effectiveness in general education courses.

* See SUU Policy 6.8.3 for additional details about the GE Committee

To be approved at the November 28, 2016 GE meeting

Present: John Allred, Ann Diekema, John Karpel, Cynthia Kimball Davis, Adam Lambert, Leilani Nautu, Michael Ostrowsky, Josh Price, James Sage, Emma Schafer, Madalyn Swanson, John Taylor, and Bonny Rayburn.

I. Call to Order: 3:35 pm

II. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of prior GE Committee Meeting minutes (October 10, 2016, posted in Canvas), approved unanimously.

III. Discussion & Action Items

A. GE Curriculum Management Workgroup:

- New Appendix B has two aspects to it.
  - How to approve a new Gen Ed course.
  - How to review existing Gen Ed courses.
- GE review of existing GE courses (based on Appendix B, posted in Canvas)
  - 3 year cycle
  - Fall 2016:
    - Written Communication, American Institutions, Quantitative Literacy, Information Literacy, Digital Literacy, and Integrated Learning
    - Thirteen courses submitted information including a sample syllabus (100% response).
    - Answers to survey questions (Handout)
- Trends and other observations (draft write-up provided by GE Curriculum Management workgroup)
- Take-aways and recommendations:
  - Follow-up questions for Question 6
    - If so, does pre-req still make sense?
  - Follow-up questions for Question 7
    - Which majors?
    - If yours, does it still make sense to have that course as a requirement for the major?
    - Have you reached out to the department requiring the course to see if it is still meeting needs?
  - Follow-up questions for Question 8
    - If not, does this cause a problem or confusion?
  - Global follow-up
    - Having now reviewed these questions, do you have any questions for the Gen Ed Committee or are there any other needs related to these questions?
  - GE Committee to ask Office of Institutional Research & Assessment to contact Gen Ed faculty members regarding ELO assessment (non-submissions and wrong ELOs).

IV. Adjourn – Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

General Education Committee (GEC)

Minutes: Monday, November 28, 2016, 4:00 pm
Old Main 106

COMMITTEE CHARGE

SCOPE: GEC is responsible for providing quality and oversight of all of the General Education courses offered at SUU, and it is expected to ensure compliance with state-mandated policies on General Education and alignment with SUU's strategic and academic plans.

GEC RESPONSIBILITIES*

1. Work with faculty, staff, and students to ensure SUU offers and maintains a comprehensive, assessable, and dynamic general education program that meets the agreed upon institutional learning outcomes and g
2. Develop and coordinate the GEC's operation in cooperation with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC)
3. Provide oversight of the General Education courses offered at SUU.
4. Work with the Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning (CETL) to help support faculty teaching effectiveness in general education courses.

* See SUU Policy 6.8.3 for additional details about the GE Committee

To be approved at the February 6, 2017 GE meeting

Present: John Allred, John Belk, Ann Diekema, Jon Karpel, Cynthia Kimball Davis, Adam Lambert, Johnny MacLean, Leilani Nautu, Michael Ostrowsky, Josh Price, James Sage, Emma Schafer, Madalyn Swanson, John Taylor, and Bonny Rayburn.

I. Call to Order: 4:05 pm

II. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of prior GE Committee Meeting minutes (October 31, 2016, in Canvas)

- Approved unanimously

III. Discussion & Action Items

- Committee meetings next semester will continue to be on Mondays. If you have conflicts with the regular day and time, please let James know.
- First meeting should be toward the end of January.

A. GE Curriculum Management Workgroup

- Follow-up GE Curriculum Review message was distributed to Department Chairs (copy of "Complete Packet" available in Canvas)
  - James modified the summary and recommendations, the email that went out to the Chairs, and the emails to the Chairs about courses that were found to be out of compliance regarding ELOs being included in their syllabi.
  - A version of the packet was provided to the Deans.
  - Prompts are included on the renewal form in blue text and committee members agreed that they should be included when sent out for our next round.
  - The first emails were sent out to the Chairs on Thanksgiving.
  - The follow up email as well as the customized messages will be sent out next week.
  - Will ask them to fill out the online form again and attach the new syllabi that include the ELOs by the first Friday of Spring semester (January 7th).
  - If they have any questions, James can meet with them.
  - Will provide 3 examples of ways to include ELOs in Syllabi.
- In preparation: Spring 2017 GE Curriculum Review (Humanities Knowledge Area – 30 courses, in Canvas)
  - On the radar: approval process for new GE courses (see Appendix B for details, in Canvas)

General Education Committee (GEC)

Minutes: Monday, November 28, 2016, 4:00 pm
Old Main 106

B. GE Assessment Workgroup

- GE Assessment Results: reminder that Dashboards now available on the mySUU portal: https://my.suu.edu/dashboard
- Christian has set up a TracDat to handle GE Assessment information (learning outcomes, curriculum map, assessment cycle, etc.); handout available in Canvas depicting alignment between "typical" components of assessment plans, the categories in TracDat, and alignment with NWCCU Standards; Christian has also uploaded all Canvas-based GE Assessment data into TracDat
    - Next Steps: complete steps related to Assessment Results/Targets and Action & Follow-Up
    - Need to establish target to continue to motivate participation.
    - Participation rates – used to be 60% now 52% - 75% would be a good goal for Gen Ed sections
    - Student achievement – make target match highest mark
    - Can set different targets for each ELO
    - Important not to tie to one specific question…needs to be accumulative
- Johnny will set-up next meeting for GE Assessment Workgroup
    - Expect Doodle Poll for early January.
    - Will send out draft of an assessment plan.
    - Meeting in early January will be spent discussing that assessment plan and coming up with an action plan to address those areas on the map that have not yet been developed.

C. GE Resources Workgroup

- Develop support resources for assessment and curriculum management (web resources, FAQs, collaborate with CETL, etc.); some materials already exist online: https://www.suu.edu/academics/provost/gened.html
- Schedule next "GE Academy" (follow-up from Welcome Week)
- Also: possibly engage the campus in discussions about the overall role, aim, and mission of GE at SUU using "Town Hall" format

IV. Adjourn – Meeting was adjourned at 5:45 pm

General Education Committee (GEC)

MINUTES: Monday, February 6, 2017, 4 pm
Old Main 106

COMMITTEE CHARGE

SCOPE: GEC is responsible for providing quality and oversight of all of the General Education courses offered at SUU, and it is expected to ensure compliance with state-mandated policies on General Education and alignment with SUU's strategic and academic plans.

GEC RESPONSIBILITIES*

1. Work with faculty, staff, and students to ensure SUU offers and maintains a comprehensive, assessable, and dynamic general education program that meets the agreed upon institutional learning outcomes and goals.
2. Develop and coordinate the GEC's operation in cooperation with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC)
3. Provide oversight of the General Education courses offered at SUU.
4. Work with the Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning (CETL) to help support faculty teaching effectiveness in general education courses.

* See SUU Policy 6.8.3 for additional details about the GE Committee

To be approved at the February 27, 2017 GE meeting

Present: John Belk, Anne Diekema, Jon Karpel, Cynthia Kimball Davis, Adam Lambert, Johnny MacLean, Josh Price, James Sage, Emma Schafer, Madalyn Swanson.

Excused: Leilani Nautu Michael Ostrowsky Bonny Rayburn

I. **Call to Order:** 4:11 pm

II. **Approval of Minutes**

- Previous GE Committee meeting – November 28, 2016 (in Canvas)

III. **Announcements**

- NWCCU Mid-Cycle Evaluation: a small taskforce is preparing the brief (10-15 page) report for SUU's third-year Mid-Cycle Evaluation; will include a campus visit on April 24-25, 2017. As part of that report, James will prepare a few pages on General Education.
- Several courses are expected to petition for GE approval, including: ORPT 2040, CHIN 1010, CHIN 1020, and INTG 1000. We should expect these courses to come to the GE Curriculum Management workgroup first (in early March), then to the GE Committee as a whole (probably at the March 27 meeting).
- The Commissioner's Office is developing a policy regarding course level definitions (1000-level, 2000-level, 3000-level, 4000-level, etc. After the Regents GE Task Force refused to engage this issue, this is being headed up (reluctantly) by Liz Hitch. James will provide additional details to the GE Committee (and the UUCC and the UGCC) as they are available.
- The February 27, 2017 GE Committee meeting will be dedicated to the Spring 2017 GE Curriculum Review report coming from the GE Curriculum Review workgroup.
- The Provost (in conjunction with the Department of Computer Science and Information Systems (CSIS) have been discussing ways for the Digital Literacy learning outcome to be met (including CSIS 1000 and other options). Additional information will be provided as details emerge; Nathan Barker may come to a future GE Committee meeting to discuss this topic (TBA).

IV. **Discussion & Action Items**

1. *GE Curriculum Management:*
    a. Fall 2016 – received updated GE course syllabi from the three department chairs. Feedback process is generating desired results.
        i. Several key discussions are underway as a result of this curriculum review process: the ENGR course (GE Humanities) is being discussed in terms of fit; various language courses are being discussed (SPAN, GERM, FREN, and CHIN) as suitable GE Humanities courses (especially with

General Education Committee (GEC)

MINUTES: Monday, February 6, 2017, 4 pm
Old Main 106

respect to the "Critical Thinking" learning outcome); other courses are also being discussed with GE Committee members as suitable GE courses.

b. Spring 2017 – message sent (on Thanksgiving Day) to department chairs for 30 Humanities courses; responses were due by February 3, 2017; approximately 23/30 responses have been received (as of the time of the GE Committee meeting). A reminder was sent out on Saturday, February 4, 2017.
    i. Updated Fall 2016 assessment reports are posted in Canvas (showing overall participation, participation by ELO, and student performance/achievement).

c. Curriculum Management workgroup will meet (Feb. 7) and will deliberate and provide a draft report to be discussed at the next GE Committee meeting (February 27, 2017), which will be the main focus that meeting.

2. *GE Assessment:*
    a. Workgroup met on January 11, 2017 to discuss draft GE Assessment Plan; the draft plan is organized around the seven (7) main components found in TracDat and are typically found in assessment plans. A copy of that draft plan has been uploaded to Canvas along with a draft set of "guiding questions" related to program-level assessment (also sent via Canvas e-mail to the GE Committee).
    b. Feedback on GE Committee gathered during GE Committee meeting: (1) What is the place of EDGE in GE assessment efforts? (Because EDGE is a graduation requirement for all students, is it worthwhile to track which ELOs EDGE is reporting; otherwise, EDGE is NOT part of GE requirements); (2) questions for Christian: (i) Are all ELO reports in the dashboard, even if the ELO emerges from a non-GE course?; (ii) When do students complete GE requirements? (iii) can GE assessment of ELOs track individual students?; (3) James noted that the 11.1-11.5 KALOs do not yet have developed assessment rubrics - James will ask a small group (separate from the workgroups) to work on these rubrics;
    c. Beyond feedback on the draft GE Assessment Plan (and "guiding questions" document), James noted the following assessment-related topics/issues that need to be addressed:
        i. ELO assignments (i.e., the "jellybean" diagram); various inconsistencies were noted in the previous versions of the document; James noted that as of Fall 2015, the "canonical" version of the ELO assignments have been posted to the "resources" page on the Provost's website; however, this still includes ambiguous assignments of ELO #11.0 (for the KALOs).
        ii. James noted that the various KALO definitions (11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, and 11.5) need to be developed into full-fledged rubrics; James agreed to assemble a small group to develop these rubrics (noted above).
        iii. James noted that Trac-Dat entries need to be entered (and maintained) for the following areas: benchmarks (or "targets") and "action and follow-up".
    d. The workgroup also discussed approaches to "Program-Based" assessment efforts and will present recommendations.

3. *GE Resources:*
    a. Will need to collaborate with CETL to plan a GE Academy for spring semester, or possibly for the period of time after the "grades due" day (May 4) and the end of the contract period for 9-month faculty:
        i. Specific dates are: Monday, May 8 thru Friday May 12.
        ii. A consolidated schedule of events (similar to the fall "Welcome Week" schedule) will be developed that includes various professional development opportunity for faculty and staff; this could include a "GE Academy" offering.
    b. Looking ahead to Fall 2017 (pre-semester contract period) to plan some professional development for GE faculty during the three (3) days prior to the start of "Welcome Week".

V. **Adjourn:** 5:39 pm

General Education Committee (GEC)

MINUTES: Monday, February 27, 2017, 4 pm
Old Main 106

COMMITTEE CHARGE

SCOPE: GEC is responsible for providing quality and oversight of all of the General Education courses offered at SUU, and it is expected to ensure compliance with state-mandated policies on General Education and alignment with SUU's strategic and academic plans.

GEC RESPONSIBILITIES*

1. Work with faculty, staff, and students to ensure SUU offers and maintains a comprehensive, assessable, and dynamic general education program that meets the agreed upon institutional learning outcomes and goals.
2. Develop and coordinate the GEC's operation in cooperation with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC)
3. Provide oversight of the General Education courses offered at SUU.
4. Work with the Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning (CETL) to help support faculty teaching effectiveness in general education courses.

* See SUU Policy 6.8.3 for additional details about the GE Committee

To be approved at the March 27, 2017 GE meeting

Present: John Belk, Anne Diekema (by phone), Jon Karpel, Cynthia Kimball Davis, Adam Lambert, Leilani Nautu, Michael Ostrowsky, Josh Price, James Sage, Emma Schafer, Madalyn Swanson, Johnny MacLean, James Sage, Nathan Barker, & Bonny Rayburn

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

- Previous GE Committee meeting – February 6, 2017 (in Canvas)
  - Approved unanimously with one minor change.

III. Announcements / Presentations

1. *Nathan Barker – options related to CSIS 1000* – Nathan teaches CSIS 1000 which is a GE course. SUU has a small number of courses that cover integrated learning and digital literacy and, because of that, enrollment growth is putting quite a strain on faculty resources in those areas. Provost Cook has asked Nathan and the GE Committee to begin discussions on how to try to alleviate some of this strain. Right now CSIS 1000 mainly covers Microsoft Office.

   Nathan presented a Power Point presentation laying out seven different options he has come up with that might help, including testing out and student choice. Out of the seven options he presented, his favorite, is the one that offers the following:

   - CSIS 1000 – 3 credits
     Or
   - Test out **AND**
   - Complete 3 credits from a listing of class options to be determined.

   Committee members discussed these ideas:

   - Many faculty members seem to struggle with the difference between content and learning outcomes. More professional development should be offered to them regarding GE.
   - Is the current form of CSIS addressing the SUU definition and sub-definitions of the ELO Digital Literacy?
   - Is the teaching of Microsoft Office hitting the skills that are needed for courses in other departments?
   - If other areas would offer a GE course teaching the skills that are needed for their area, those courses could be added to the list of options that students could pick from to fulfill their 3 credit requirement.

- We could put out a call for possible course proposals that address the Digital Literacy ELO, and we could manage the acceptance based on our enrollment growth and the accompanying strain on resources, thereby phasing in other courses into the Integrative Learning Knowledge Area slowly and intentionally.

IV. Discussion & Action Items

1. *GE Curriculum Management:*
   a. Spring 2017 – Humanities: draft report from Curriculum Management workgroup for discussion and feedback (will be posted in Canvas – draft is still being finalized).

      This subcommittee met and reviewed the thirty Humanities Knowledge Area courses that were up for review this semester. James sent out a report showing information on various course sample syllabi and some draft emails to be sent to chairs regarding courses that didn't meet the curriculum management minimum requirements. Johnny asked if anyone had any comments or questions.
      - Need to get with professional development plan people and see if there is a way to incorporate the needs of the GE Committee as well. This effort should be aligned with the Strategic Plan.
      - The language and tone of the report is good.
      - GE faculty need some training. There are some resources online but it would be better if it were all in one place. Maybe a packet or an email.
      - On committee member suggested that the packet could be presented at the GE Academy.
      - One committee member suggested creating a CANVAS course.
      - One committee member suggested offering a one hour targeted presentation during welcome week.
      - One committee member urged us to provide resources instead of holding meetings.
      - We decided that the GE Resources Workgroup will produce a one-page document that explains the expectations of teaching a GE course that includes hyperlinks to:
        - Link to actual courses and their accompanying Knowledge Areas
        - Definitions of knowledge areas
        - Statement – Include ELOs in syllabus
        - Jellybean diagram
        - ELO definitions
        - CANVAS assessment tutorial

2. *GE Assessment:*
   a. Draft GE Assessment Plan is still being developed; please share any feedback/suggestions you might have (previous draft of the assessment plan is posted in Canvas).
   b. Three tiered model to assess GE
      i. Course-based assessment
      ii. Program-based assessment
      iii. Institutional surveys

   Have talked about dividing program-based assessment into two parts:
   a. Assessment that could lead to structural changes – the GE Assessment Workgroup is currently working on a draft of a survey to be sent to faculty that could provide valuable information related to structural improvements in the GE Program.
   b. Assessment of student achievement – 1) Maybe e-portfolio 2) We already have course-based data shown at the program level in our Dashboard, which may be useful in our program-based assessment. The GE Assessment Workgroup will continue to discuss the most appropriate and feasible ways to assess student achievement at the program level. All suggestions are welcome.

c. Johnny will schedule a GE Assessment Workgroup meeting in March.

3. *GE Resources:*
   a. Plan a GE Academy and other professional development, perhaps during the (new) "Post-Commencement" Professional Development week (May 8 – May 12)
   b. One page document with hyperlinks to resources for GE faculty
   c. GE Resources work group will create the document.
   d. Johnny will schedule a GE Resources Workgroup meeting in March.

V. **Adjourn** – Meeting was adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

General Education Committee (GEC)

MINUTES: Monday, March 27, 2017, 4 pm
Old Main 106

COMMITTEE CHARGE

SCOPE: GEC is responsible for providing quality and oversight of all of the General Education courses offered at SUU, and it is expected to ensure compliance with state-mandated policies on General Education and alignment with SUU's strategic and academic plans.

GEC RESPONSIBILITIES*

1. Work with faculty, staff, and students to ensure SUU offers and maintains a comprehensive, assessable, and dynamic general education program that meets the agreed upon institutional learning outcomes and goals.
2. Develop and coordinate the GEC's operation in cooperation with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC)
3. Provide oversight of the General Education courses offered at SUU.
4. Work with the Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning (CETL) to help support faculty teaching effectiveness in general education courses.

* See SUU Policy 6.8.3 for additional details about the GE Committee

To be approved at the April 17, 2017 GE meeting

Present: John Belk, Anne Diekema, Jon Karpel, Cynthia Kimbal Davis, Johnny MacLean, John Meisner, Leilani Nautu, Michael Ostrowsky, Christian Reiner, James Sage, Emma Schafer, James Drury, and Bonny Rayburn.

Not present: John Allred, Adam Lambert, Josh Price, Wendy Sanders, Madalyn Swanson, and John Taylor.

I. **Call to Order:** Meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. **Approval of Minutes**

- Previous GE Committee meeting – February 27, 2017 (in Canvas)
  - Approved unanimously.

III. **Announcements**

- There is a final report on the spring 2017 curriculum management effort.
- This was not shared with the deans.
- This was meant for the committee members so please don't share it.
- Please take the survey when Johnny sends it to you.
- For our next meeting in April we have a couple of courses that the curriculum management committee will take a look at as a new GE designation.
- There will also be an update on the draft GE assessment plan.

remove

IV. **Discussion & Action Items**

1. *GE Curriculum Management:*
   a. Spring 2017 – Humanities: finalized report from Curriculum Management workgroup; updates on feedback provided to department chairs.
      - Reviewed 30 humanities courses
      - Sent out generic chair's email with the additional prompts
      - Sent dedicated emails out to the chairs, associate chairs, and sometimes the professors
      - Encouraged them to list the ELOs as they are officially adopted
      - Alerted the chairs when faculty included misleading university policies
      - Explained the assigned ELOs as opposed to the ELOs they were able to choose
      - Recommend having a hyperlink leading to more detailed information and maybe some example videos on how faculty members are teaching ELOs.
      - Faculty should be made aware of all changes at the same time.
   b. Upcoming meeting will focus on the courses that have been proposed to have new GE designation.

DRAFT

General Education Committee (GEC)

MINUTES: Monday, March 27, 2017, 4 pm
Old Main 106

2. *GE Assessment:*
    a. Updates from workgroup; updates re: draft GE Assessment Plan.
        - The assessment workgroup is revising the draft assessment plan.
        - It includes program level assessment and part of it is a survey and part of it is using the dashboard data to identify patterns.
        - The survey will be sent out to faculty to find out what faculty understand and where they think the levels of importance are.
        - This survey could also be used as an educational opportunity for faculty members who have never read the ELO definitions or the knowledge area definitions or the core area definitions.
        - Johnny will send out the survey to committee members.
        - Please focus on the content, not the formatting as the formatting will be tweaked later.
        - Be prepared to spend 10 – 15 minutes on the survey as it is pretty long.
    b. Upcoming meeting will focus on the draft faculty survey and the revised Draft GE Assessment Plan

3. *GE Resources:*
    a. Updates from workgroup; specifically a draft "1-page" resource sheet and draft "1-page" checklist for GE faculty:
        - These two 1-page documents include guidance for faculty teaching GE courses. But when developing these guidelines, we realized that it would force us to address the issue of recommending to faculty how to gather/report assessment data. This prompted James to invite Christian Reiner (Executive Director of Institutional Research & Assessment) to join our meeting.
        - Christian gave an overview of data collection and how we might be able to draw inferences from the data submitted.
        - If several data entries are submitted for the same student and the same ELO (across different courses), he uses the highest number in his findings as opposed to averaging the entries.
        - If only one data entry is made, he uses that one.
            - Disadvantage to using only one entry – It does not show progress over time.
            - Advantage to one at beginning and one at the end – Shows progress over time.
        - Committee members agreed that they would support encouraging faculty to report one score for each student per ELO toward the end of the semester. They also agreed that the wording should include language stating, if you report more than one score, we will use the highest score.
        - Please carefully consider whether one single assignment or an overview of several assignments would best represent your ELO assessment.
    b. Upcoming meeting will focus on the draft GE Handbook and planning a GE Academy for spring semester (post-commencement contract period); on the radar: look ahead to Fall 2017 for professional development the GE Academy curriculum

V. **Adjourn** – Meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

DRAFT

General Education Committee (GEC)

Minutes: Monday, April 17, 2017, 4 pm
Old Main 106

COMMITTEE CHARGE

SCOPE: GEC is responsible for providing quality and oversight of all of the General Education courses offered at SUU, and it is expected to ensure compliance with state-mandated policies on General Education and alignment with SUU's strategic and academic plans.

GEC RESPONSIBILITIES*

1. Work with faculty, staff, and students to ensure SUU offers and maintains a comprehensive, assessable, and dynamic general education program that meets the agreed upon institutional learning outcomes and goals.
2. Develop and coordinate the GEC's operation in cooperation with the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUCC)
3. Provide oversight of the General Education courses offered at SUU.
4. Work with the Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning (CETL) to help support faculty teaching effectiveness in general education courses.

* See SUU Policy 6.8.3 for additional details about the GE Committee

To be approved at the Fall 2017 GE meeting

I. **Present:** Anne Diekema, Jon Karpel, Cynthia Kimball Davis, Adam Lambert, Johnny MacLean, John Meisner, Leilani Nautu, Michael Ostrowsky, Josh Price, James Sage, Emma Schafer, Madalyn Swanson, and Bonny Rayburn.

II. **Call to Order:** Meeting called to order at 4:00 pm

III. **Approval of Minutes**

- Previous GE Committee meeting – March 27, 2017 (in Canvas)
  - Approved unanimously with two changes.

IV. **Announcements**

- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Mid-Cycle Self Evaluation
  - Site visit team on campus: Monday, April 24 and Tuesday, April 25 (finals week)
- Committee members cycling off: Josh Price and Adam Lambert. Leilani Nautu will be moving to the College of Education (which already has a representative on the committee) so she will no longer be a committee member either. James thanked all who are leaving for their contributions.
- General Education committee accomplishments for the year:
  - Approved Appendix B for policy 6.8.3 which gave us the framework for two different types of policies and procedures. One of them is a curriculum management and review plan. The second is about how to evaluate new GE course proposals.
  - We had the GE Academy in the fall during welcome week.
  - We offered quite a bit of additional professional development. John Taylor offered one in December and our friends in SUU online offered quite a few workshops and presentations.
  - We've been refining our online resources on the assessment page.
  - John Taylor brought a group of people, both faculty and students, to the Educated Persons conference.
  - We've been collecting CANVAS assessment data and we have data dashboards to be able to slice and dice that data.
  - We also have a comprehensive draft assessment plan.
  - In curriculum management, for the first time in a long time, we have reviewed GE courses and sent feedback to Chairs.
  - We've added additional prompts to the questions we asked on the on the curriculum review survey.
  - We sent back examples on how to integrate those ELOs in their syllabi.
  - We clarified the ELO assignments.
  - Even a non-response was useful.
  - We've left documentation of our accomplishments.
  - Recommend listing accomplishments in Trac Dat.

General Education Committee (GEC)

Minutes: Monday, April 17, 2017, 4 pm
Old Main 106

V. Discussion & Action Items

A. GE Curriculum Management
- Proposals for new GE designation (Action Items):
  - ORPT 2040 – existing course, recently increased to 3 credits, part of Semester in the Parks
    - This is an exceptional and detailed substantive form and would be a good example to have on our website.
    - Approved as Gen Ed course
  - INTG 1000 – new course (pending UUCC approval), 4 credits, part of Jumpstart
    - **Not approved** as Gen Ed course: 1 yes, 3 abstentions, 4 no.
    - Concerns:
      - How is INTG 1000 going to affect other programs/courses? Will it be offered outside of Jumpstart? If so, what will be the impact on LM 1010 and CSIS 1000?
      - Presumably, the new course INTG 1000 is intended to also satisfy the information literacy learning outcomes normally satisfied by LM 1010, however, there is little mention of this aspect of INTG 1000 on either the curriculum form or the sample syllabi. More attention needs to be given to the information literacy learning outcome.
      - Information Literacy is an important skill that should be taught by trained librarians. Why are librarians not being included in this? What training are the Jumpstart faculty receiving to prepare them to teach the information literacy ELO? Worried about qualifications of the various faculty members (from various disciplines) who might be teaching this course. Similar concerns were raised regarding the Digital Literacy ELO.
      - High School students will be enrolled in Jumpstart next year. If High School students enroll in Jumpstart, then will they be participating as part of Concurrent Enrollment? This raises concerns about the policies/procedures related to Concurrent Enrollment (specifically repeating Concurrent Enrollment classes). If HS students have already completed some CE courses, and then enroll in Jumpstart (which may include some repeat courses), what are the implications? Concurrent Enrollment is a complicated operation and requires coordination.
      - This course refers to ELOs in several places, but referring to ELOs is different than providing guided instruction. A stronger foundation is needed to be able to achieve the assigned ELOs.
      - Worried about double dipping and enough time-on-task for a 4-credit course that is also overlapping with other courses.

B. GE Assessment
- Draft faculty survey and the revised Draft GE Assessment Plan

C. GE Resources
- Draft GE "handbook" (updates to web and Canvas)
- Planning a GE Academy for Fall 2017

VI. Adjourn: Meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

General Education Committee (GEC)

Minutes: Monday, April 17, 2017, 4 pm
Old Main 106

Concerns regarding INTG 1000
(proposal seeking GE designation for Integrated Learning Knowledge Area)

Feedback from GE Committee – April 2017
(elaborated points assembled by James Sage to assist with re-submission of proposal)

How is INTG 1000 going to affect other programs/courses? Will it be offered outside of Jumpstart? If so, what will be the impact on LM 1010 and CSIS 1000? If it is offered outside of Jumpstart, will it be offered regularly (frequency)? If it is offered outside of Jumpstart, how many seats (impact) will it have in terms of off-setting demand for LM 1010 and CSIS 1000? Would this course be available via Concurrent Enrollment?

Presumably, the new course INTG 1000 is intended to also satisfy the Information Literacy learning outcomes normally satisfied by LM 1010, however, there is little mention of this aspect of INTG 1000 on either the curriculum form or the sample syllabi. More attention needs to be given to the Information Literacy learning outcome. Information Literacy is an important skill that should be taught by trained librarians. Why are librarians not being included in this? And if librarians aren't being included in this, what training are the Jumpstart faculty receiving to prepare them to teach the information literacy ELO? Similar concerns were raised regarding the Digital Literacy ELO.

Ensure adequate basis to address the KALOs and ELOs: the Integrated Learning Knowledge Area Learning Outcomes (KALOs) are equivalent to the following three ELOs: Integrative Learning, Information Literacy, and Digital Literacy. While these are listed on the sample syllabus, there are concerns about the depth of structured instruction provided to help students achieve greater levels of learning. In support of the Assignments/Projects listed on the sample syllabus, various activities are described where students would be required to perform tasks that include using spreadsheets, producing digital narratives, preparing presentations, pamphlets, and posters, as well as researching geological time periods and "barbarian" groups that invaded the Roman Empire. Listing activities that require students to perform tasks related to these ELOs is not the same as providing structured, guided instruction to students about these ELOs. Presumably, a "just-in-time" instructional delivery method will be used to provide instruction in support student learning within the context of completing a larger assignment (which itself integrates across different classes/disciplines). But what training/preparation will the faculty have to ensure that this "just-in-time" instruction will be effective?

Worries about time-on-task and about double dipping. As a 4-credit "lecture" course, INTG 1000 should include the following amount of student effort: for a 15-week semester, the course should include 4 hours of face-to-face instruction each week. And for each hour spent in class, students are expected to invest another 2 hours of effort, for a total of 8 hours of effort outside of class. Altogether, students should be investing approximately 12 hours each week for this course. Now, in the context of Jumpstart, INTG 1000 would be spread across the entire academic year (30 weeks), so the average number of hours Jumpstart students should be investing in INTG 1000 each week is approximately 6 hours. That is to say, students should be spending about 6 hours each week focused on the three ELOs that are assigned to the Integrated Learning Knowledge Area. Because the activities associated with INTG 1000 are intended to be integrated with assignments and projects that also advance learning in other courses (like biology and history and geology and communication), there was a worry that this kind of integration will leave less attention on instruction that supports the type of learning associated with the affiliated ELOs for INTG 1000.