

November 2017 Meeting Minutes (approved)

Thursday, November 9, 2017 11:21 AM

Minutes of the meeting of the Council on General Education and Collegiate Programs, November 8, 2017

In Attendance: T. Altena, T. Arthaud, M. Bowe, R. Darabi, T. Dicke, K. Gibson, G. Jackson-Brown, S. Lancaster, M. Murray, S. Senger, J. Smith, J. Strong, F. Thornton Miller, E. Walker, M. Woolsey, Y. Zhang

Not In Attendance: L. Brazeal, K. Franklin, K. Hubbard, T. Miller

Guests: B. Garland, A. Hass, V. Rodriguez de la Vega, A. Young

The Council on General Education and Intercollegiate Programs met at 3:30 PM on WEDNESDAY, November 8, 2017 in PSU 317.

AGENDA

I. WELCOME

Meeting called to order at 3:34 p.m. by Beth Walker.

1. Welcome members

II. OLD BUSINESS

1. Approval of minutes from October 11th meeting

Annual Report Review Schedule and Process Motion from K. Gibson, second from Murray, approved by voice vote

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Program Changes Asian Studies & Linguistics

Change to Asian Studies Program/interdisciplinary studies (Jack Llewelyn not present) explained by Josh Smith and John Strong, that Yoga and Meditation is moving from a topics class to Category 2 with other religious studies classes, including Asian philosophy. The department of philosophy has no objections.

Motion to accept the change from Smith, seconded by Gibson, approved on voice vote.

Linguistics program is adding two course options (presented by guest V. Rodriguez de la Vega).

Motion to approve from Murray, seconded by Arthaud, approved by voice vote.

2. New Gen Ed Course Application CRM 220 (Gen Ed Proposal)

Bowe states that reviewers' opinion was that it seemed like a good fit, but only covered three SLOs and the assessment plan was a little vague. This was noted as a concern, not an objection. When asked for clarification, Bowe stated that responsibility for assessment duties wasn't clearly defined. Brett Garland states that he is the coordinator, outlines the assessment process for the committee.

The confusion seems to have resulted from new members not having access to view some hyperlinks within the system—the information was provided in the proposal. The issue of 3 SLOs is discussed, with the guest explaining the rationale for inclusion and means of assessment, and addresses questions from reviewers. Bowe acknowledges that this is sufficient explanation to address reviewer concerns. Senger arrives as his written feedback to the proposal is being discussed, and emphasizes that they were minor criticisms.

Strong asks about 'enrollment pressures' regarding the previous month's discussion, and avoiding bottlenecks in certain course groupings. Garland responds, stating enrollment trends by time of day (evening classes not being currently popular & losing enrollment to online). Strong says that his

department has empty seats that they would like to fill, and is concerned that this would further reduce enrollment in his day classes. And that it overlaps with other offerings. This is addressed by GUEST, saying that the timeliness of the subject matter and relevance to students' lives of crime-related issues is something that's missing from the curriculum, and that this provides a perspective that is not present. Garland adds that while the focus on crime might seem more narrow than other discipline's offerings, it shows the interconnectedness of knowledge from various fields (e.g., sociology, psychology) in a way that makes the scope broader than it would seem.

Strong states that this is similar to the rationale for REL131, and he remains concerned that it would reduce enrollment in those courses. Garland responds to question from Smith about moving the course from upper- to lower-level, specifically is it aimed at Criminology majors or truly a general education course. Says that there are no pre-reqs, and that it is broad. Guest states that it includes a lot of knowledge that is practical and useful for all citizens.

Murray asks, as restated by Smith, if the course is filling a genuine gap in the curriculum, beyond simply being a good fit for the curriculum, which has been recognized. Garland distinguishes it from other Criminology courses and emphasizes its multidisciplinary approach as unique to this course, and its different SLO goals. Darabi states that this would only be a second CRIM course in the GenEd curriculum, and that it could serve as a useful introduction to the major for students. The GUEST agrees that this is an advantage. Garland notes that they are not trying to infringe or take students from anyone, but that Criminology is not. There is some discussion of the issue of how departments handle the issue of overflow, additional sections, etc., and that it varies widely.

Call the Question from Gibson, 2nd Arthaud. Approved by voice vote.

Motion to approve: Arthaud, seconded by Bowe. Approved with one opposing vote from Strong.

Smith instructs reviewers in follow-up procedure involving two CGEIP Reviewer Summaries (Senger & Bowe) CRM 220 (Faculty Senate Form).

Murray asks if there are specific guidelines on number of assessment goals for a course, since that's an often-seen recommendation. Smith states that the focus is on quality rather than specific quantity, and Bowe reminds Murray that some of the assessment comments stemmed from the fact that the reviewers didn't have access to the hyperlinks.

3. General Education Application Reviews

New Course and New Quantitative Literacy

MTH 136: Precalculus 1 – Smith and Altena volunteer as reviewers for the course.

SLO Changes to Gen Ed Application

CFD 163: Relationships in Today's Families – Bowe and Senger volunteer as reviewers.

4. Annual Report Reviews

First-year Programs (Gibson/Lancaster)

GEP101 & UHC110 reviewer summaries are shown on projector, Gibson provides oral summary. Both are considered '*excellent*' reports.

After brief discussion, committee decides to focus only on non-excellent reviews.

Public Issues (Gibson/Lancaster)

Public Issues courses receiving '*excellent*' reports included CIS200, ENG222, KIN210, KIN286.

ECO101 is noted as a '*good*' report, per Gibson meeting requirements, but not exceeding them.

ENG201 is noted as a '*good*' report. Lancaster notes that this stemmed from only one person taking responsibility for assessment, instead of involving a team, and the need to improve rubrics.

PHI105 is noted as having '*opportunity for improvement.*' Gibson notes that only one faculty member is involved in assessment, and that more measures would be useful. And more coherence in the report.

Per Gibson: they only used one assessment question.

PHI115: *'Opportunity for improvement.'* Gibson suggests that assessment is the problem again, and that while PHI faculty agreed that more needed to be done, there is no currently stated plan.

Smith mentions presence of social-science rubrics on the Assessment website as a potential tool for course coordinators who need to make changes. Gibson notes that there might've been a technical glitch as well, as some responses did not seem complete. Smith notes that using Chrome with Microsoft forms could be responsible.

PLN100: *'Opportunity for improvement.'* Gibson notes the lack of coordination between faculty, and need to provide detail regarding assessment tools, etc.

Murray, Smith, Gibson note that it's important to double-check on possible technical issues, as these might've been among 'lost data' if submitters were using Chrome. Committee looks at submitted reports to see if this can be determined on the spot. The investigation is inconclusive.

SOC152: *'Opportunity for improvement.'* Gibson states that there was no link between assessment question given to students and how/why it is used and connects to SLOs. In each case, Gibson and Lancaster recommended that they contact the Office of Assessment for assistance.

No reviews required for CRM210, EDC249, GEO200 (entered General Education Fall 2016)

CSC210 still needs to submit Annual report [to be reviewed in January, 2018]

Smith and Walker state that English has not re-submitted the forms after being asked to by reviewers. Committee decides to send an additional reminder in case there was a communication mishap, and that cc'ing the dean would be a useful precaution.

Written Communication/Info. Literacy (Smith/Zhang)

Oral Communication (Smith/Zhang)

COM115:

Some discussion about how to handle report submission for courses that have not been recently taught—and for removal after a given amount of time, as happened with a Kinesiology writing course. Approved as 'good' report.

Quantitative Literacy (Smith/Zhang)

Smith: MTH130 *'Opportunity for improvement.'* Currently no stated action plan, though it is pending. There is concern that the SLOs with room for improvement are shared across classes emphasizing them.

MTH 135: For identical reasons, approved as *'opportunity for improvement.'*

MTH138: *'Opportunity for improvement.'* SLOs have been added, and a plan is in place for the course.

Motion to approve recommendations from Altana. Second from Murray. Approved.

5. Update on Core Curriculum Transfer Act (SB 997) - Josh Smith

Motion to move item to next meeting from this meeting from Smith, second from Senger. Approved.

IV. ADJOURNMENT Adjourned by Walker at 4:46 p.m.

The next CGEIP meeting will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, December 6, 2017 in CARR 203.