

# December 2017 Meeting Minutes (approved)

Wednesday, December 6, 2017

3:27 PM

## I. **Minutes of the meeting of the Council on General Education and Collegiate Programs, December 6, 2017**

In Attendance: T. Arthaud, L. Brazeal, G. Jackson-Brown, M. Bowe, K. Gibson, F. Thornton Miller, M. Murray, S. Senger, J. Smith, J. Strong, E. Walker, M. Woolsey

Not In Attendance: T. Altena, R. Darabi, K. Franklin, K. Hubbard, S. Lancaster, Y. Zhang

Guests: B. Hurst (proxy for T. Dicke), A. Young

Meeting convened at 3:35.

## II. **WELCOME**

### a. **Welcome members**

## III. **OLD BUSINESS**

### 1. **Approval of minutes from November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting**

Review of minutes revealed some updates necessary. Approval of minutes will be revisited at the next meeting (Motion: Gibson, Second: Arthaud, approved by voice vote)

Edit annual report review from Smith/Zhang with [summaries](#).

### 2. **Annual Report Reviews**

Public Issues (Gibson/Lancaster) – [CSC 210](#) submitted now

Written Communication/Info. Literacy (Smith/Zheng) – [ENG 110](#) submitted now

Written Communication/Integrative & Applied Learning – [ENG 210](#), [ENG 310](#) submitted (T. Altena's responsibility, currently absent due to illness)

Life Sciences (Senger/Murray) – [BMS 110](#) and [BMS 111](#) submitted; BIO 111 not submitted

Discussion notes that this is the current status of reports, but per Smith we might need to talk to Computer Services for a process that turns submissions into reports without requiring additional manual formatting, since this is causing issues for some reports. Additional issues with the difficulty of adapting CGEIP's tasks to Office 365 are discussed.

### 3. **[Update on Core Curriculum Transfer Act \(SB 997\)](#) - Josh Smith**

Council members decided to move this item to the January, 2018 meeting.

## III. **NEW BUSINESS**

### 1. **Gen Ed Course Application Change**

[CFD 163](#) (Gen Ed Proposal)

- Two CGEIP Reviewer Summaries (Bowe & Senger)
  - Bowe and Senger summarize for group, including suggestions for improvement. Also noted is appreciation that the author used prior feedback in the current version.
  - Discussion between Walker, Senger and Smith on process for using current online system to approve, finalize the report. (Motion to approve: Bowe, second: Smith, approved on voice vote).

### 2. **New Gen Ed Course Application**

[MTH 136](#) (Gen Ed Proposal)

- Two CGEIP Reviewer Summaries (Smith & Altena)

Smith summarizes for the group.

MTH 136 (Faculty Senate Form)

Some discussion of pending change to math curriculum, and this course's role between Smith and Senger. Absence of course content (e.g., a rough schedule or topics covered) is noted as a potentially serious shortcoming, though that failure to approve will mean it does not make the fall 2018 catalog deadline. It is suggested that the report be approved with a request to provide additional details before it goes to Faculty Senate. Senger agrees in capacity as math faculty. (Motion: Gibson, second: Senger & Arthaud, approved by voice vote)

**Course Change**

MTH138 (Faculty Senate Form)

- Prerequisite and Course Description Change
  - Smith notes that it is to combine 136 & 137 in keeping with new curriculum, as two 3-credit courses or one 5-credit courses—this is a directive from the state. (Motion to approve: Gibson, second: Murray, approved on voice vote).

4. Annual Report Reviews

Life Sciences (Murray/Senger)

After discussion of the location (in 365) and process from Smith, Murray summarizes BIO course reports for the group. **BIO100 & 101** rated *excellent*.

Reminder from Walker that we will again acknowledge the best reports submitted this year and for members to keep in mind which they might nominate for consideration.

Smith notes that lab courses are 'double assessed,' which fits state requirements, but might not be the best system for internal assessment (e.g., prompting criticism of reports for "looking the same" when the courses are essentially the same).

Murray summarizes **BIO121**, rated *good to excellent*. Senger notes that he would, upon consideration, improve his evaluation to *excellent*.

**BMS100**: Murray summarizes, and Senger notes the need for details to be 'fleshed out' a bit more. Rated as *good*.

**BMS101**: Senger and Murray agree that it is rated *excellent*.

**GLG115**: Murray summarizes his comments, including some shortcomings of the report. Senger concurs, with both rating it *good*.

Written Communication/Integrative & Applied Learning (Brazeal/Altena)

Altena was unable to attend due to illness so need his comments on these annual reports in January.

**AGR320**: Brazeal summarizes her comments, with observation that content doesn't appear linked to SLOs. Rated '*opportunities for improvement*.'

**ENG210 & 310** were received late and noted for an absence of data collection for the courses, now and in previous years. Brazeal suggests revisiting them in January. Question from Murray clarifies that while data isn't necessary to include, a plan or discussion of same is necessary. Brazeal rated '*opportunities for improvement*.'

**ENG221**: Brazeal notes substantial improvement since last year. Rated '*good to excellent*' by Brazeal.

**ENG321**: Brazeal cites broadness of rubric and lack of clear connection to SLO as an issue. Discussion ensues of constructive suggestions that can be provided, such as refining SLOs to improve focus. Rated '*good*.'

**GLG358**: Lack of clarity in data collected was an issue for Brazeal, though it might have stemmed from lack of understanding of process on the part of instructor. Rated '*opportunities for*

*improvement.'*

**HST210:** Brazeal suggests that the data collected isn't tied to Gen-Ed level SLOs, but probably could be without major changes. Rated '*opportunities for improvement.*'

**NUR472:** Rated '*opportunities for improvement,*' per Brazeal.

(Approve Life Sciences: Smith, Second: Brazeal; approved on voice vote.)

(Motion to approve the completed Written Communication reports and revisit the unfinished ENG reports with Altena is proposed by Arthaud, seconded by Murray.)

5. **Discussion on Revision of Gen Ed Assessment Plan - Walker**

Walker cites new standards from state and potential for creating different standards between MSU courses. Smith notes standard of quantitative literacy goals, and what constitutes same—e.g., does a grade of D count, or only a C? Also the potential for 'double assessment' in social sciences. And possibility of high-achieving students to have to take an extra quantitative literacy course unnecessarily.

Walker suggests a meeting between now and January meeting to revisit issue in depth and summarize for the next meeting, as we are not in a position to approve the matter at present.

MTH181 and up--Since for two years we have not received formal reports for two years, Gibson moves that they be removed from General Education. Seconded by Arthaud.

6. **Other**

A. **ADJOURNMENT**

Discussion follows, and motion to dismiss from Smith, second by Arthaud.