CGEIP Minutes 2/7/2024

Attendees: Christine Sudbrock, COA; Kristin Harper, RCASH; Cathy Van Landuyt, COB; Jaime Gnau, MCHHS; Emery Bryant, MCHHS; Catherine H Hoegeman, RCASH; Helena Metzger, CNAS; Raegen Wiechert, LIB. Scott Zimmerman. Subhasree Basu Roy; Kelly Wood; Jacob Schneider; Yan

Attendees: Yan guidy
Guests: Josh Smith, Toby Dogwiler, Nancy Gordon.

I. Welcome and Announcements

II. Old Business
   a. December 2023 minutes – Approved.
   b. Update on CORE 42 meeting. – Notes in section on New Business – Josh Smith Update.
   c. Update on integrating New Gen Ed Course Proposal into the new CAW system. - This is not possible from the programming side.
   d. Check-in on Gen Ed Course Evaluations – still waiting to hear back on some. A few more have come in. Katie has been updating the SharePoint Folder.
      i. Go to 2023 Reports – Review Status List to find out which reports you are responsible for. Highlighted in red means that they need to be tracked down.
      ii. Each course has its own Folder in the SharePoint 2023 Reports. In that folder will be the Syllabus and the Report.
      iii. How To Review – in "Reviewer Resources" Folder – there is a Video and there is a Document Overview Word Doc. Use these to conduct your Reviewer Reports.
      iv. Spring Break is a Goal Due Date for having your Reports done.
         • Add the document directly to the Report in the Course Folder – Put comments straight into the Report in the folder, using Word Doc "Comment" feature.
         • If you HAVE completed the Report –in the Review Status List Excel sheet next to your name write "Done," so that you can indicate when you've completed a report.
         • Coordinators currently do not have a way to give feedback to our comments. Every once in a while we will get feedback in emails, but there is not a formal process. They cannot see our comments until we email it to them.
         • "Team Lead" – Joe set it up last year. A Team Lead will be responsible for checking in with and tracking down to make sure the reviewers have completed the reports. You can also ask questions of them,
   e. Update on SB 1075

III. New Business
   a. Josh Smith Core 42 Update

i. Applications for MOTR IDS 2 – Wellness for the Individual Course. 102. Interdisciplinary, count towards the extra 5 credits. A Course fit that, helped in the design to match it in 210 currently in GEN ED. 2 credits instead of 3 because of the lab option at some schools. 11 courses put through to be put into 42, 10 of them passed.
   - One course was not approved because - If a course has a pre-rec of another MOTR course, it cannot be in it.
ii. Several of these courses are not in our Gen Ed, but are now in CORE 42. Perhaps we could think about adding these into our Gen Ed.
   - Very excited that now all of our Classical Languages are in, some of these are offered at OTC, as the World Languages were in already.
   - Courses NOT in MSU Gen Ed, but now in CORE 42 – AGB 144; KIN 250; LTN 101; HBW 101; GRK 101; LTN 102; HBW 102; GRK 102.
iii. 12 Courses were tabled because it was too interdisciplinary.
   - Introduction to Higher Education – on track to be submitted to Core 42. 2 or 1 credit, but need to meet problem-solving and other criteria.
   - Global Education etc.
   - Seems like they only want to do one thing a year.
iv. IDS things might be able for us to grow courses in this section.
v. When we look at Gen Ed vs. Core 42 and there are some overlap.
   - Our Public Issues and Cultural Competence area are much more specific to the university, so it is hard for some of them to be included in the Core 42.
   - All of our sciences are in there. Doing a good job keeping and putting ours into Core 42.
   - A lot of Performance courses might be removed from Core 42 (might be removed in the near-future because they fear they cannot assess those goals, so some categories will be phased out).
   - Sue will be attending the meetings and submitting the proposals and course changes. Any change it has to be set to Core 42 and has to be re-approved. Watch out what you make changes to, it still have to align with their goals and they will not approved it if your changes affect those goals.
b. Subhasree - Someone from CGEIP should be attending the Core 42 Meetings to help streamline the information that is being discussed as it is all interconnected. Working on getting more support for the Chair.
   - Katie says, however, when the CGEIP chair is only 1 year. Not enough time. and also hard to get people to agree to be chair, as it is a lot to learn for 1 year, but also a much larger commitment if they take it on. Several others agree.
   - Provost Fellow maybe only 1-2 years.
   - How is this going to work? What is the scope of CGEIP? A Larger conversation. We're not going to be able to integrate the new Curricular Action Workflow and the CGEIP Course Proposals. Challenges on the programing side. How is one supposed to know how to do something, and who is told when there are changes made on the programing side? There doesn't seem to be a streamlined way of seeing how it all works.

c. Curricular Action Workflow Items – the link is on the Faculty Senate website, there is a card for it. New Curricular Resources in a Word Document Katie made in the SharePoint Folder.
- New Course Proposals link and Curricular Action Workflow System.
ii. New Course Proposals
- GRY 137 – Meteorology: Understanding the Weather and Climate.
  ◦ Toby Dogwiler: seemingly simple thing, but complicated to implement. None of them are new courses, they are existing courses with lab and lecture and splitting them into separate lecture and separate lab, so that students can sign up for one or the other or both.
  ◦ In the same way that Chem and Bio work in Gen Ed already. Fits better with MOTR.
  ◦ This idea is to streamline, to help transfer students and fit better with other science courses and MOTR.
  ◦ Toby sent a Graphic to display. Splitting courses, deleting 110, and create 113 to do that. IF just did a course change on 110, then a student who failed it as a 4-credit course, they could get the 3-credit only course without the lab and get 4-credits. So by making a new course, they prevent that from happening. And a student can retake as 110 and 113.
  ◦ GLG 171 – the exact same course, just changing the number to keep it in sequence.
  ◦ GLG 115 – 3-credit non-lab course, changes only in the catalog description.
  ◦ GLG 172 – was for transfers student who only had the lecture and not the lab, which is typical for transers. So now they are changing so that we have a new Gen-Ed course but making it so that the lab is available so students just need to take the lab when they transfer.
  ◦ Current: GLG 116, 171, 172, 155 – Proposed: GLG 113, 114, 115, 116 (lab)
  ◦ Also updating the names! Earth the Instruction Manual, The Survival Guide, Life of the Past (stays the same name), Lab = Earth the Hands on Adventure. Also matches with the new department name. Repackaging the courses and streamlining.
  ◦ The same classes they're teaching now, but just new numbers. The only thing that is added to Gen Ed is the Lab class – all the others have existed in Gen Ed already.
  ◦ In 2021?, reviewed with CGEIP (under Katrina as Chair) – the lab stands alone and could be added to any. GLG 116. The same learning goals that it already had as part of 110, but the students only need lab in life science or physical science. At the time, this is what CGEIP recommended GLG propose.
- GRY 138
  ◦ Geography Changes to Proposals, similar thing.
  ◦ Current: GRY 142, 143(lab), 135 (lecture and lab)
    i. 135 is the only lab that you can take online at MSU, so it is a very popular lab. A Per-course instructor is the only one who teaches it. Splitting the courses will help allowing to have others teach it as well I

the future – to teach an online lab. Toby will be teaching it once he comes off as department head in a year and will train teaching assistants to help with that.

    ii. Helena notes that CHM 108 does also have one other online section of that lab. Now students will have GRY 135 and CHM 108 as online lab options.

    iii. CHM 107 and 117 also did a very similar thing previously. Does the lab have the lecture as the prerequisite?

- Proposed: GRY 145, 146, 137, 138 – split into lecture and Lab
- All of these courses were in Gen Ed before as the Lecture and Lab together course – now they are just being split into two classes to help students. The Assessment plans and everything are all the same, just a packaging that is different. More than 50 course proposals to get this to go through. Been working for 3 years.
- Kelly notes that this is a lot of work and demonstrates a lot of commitment from their department and helps what works best for students and for Gen Ed. It should be a model for other departments.

- GRY 145
- GLG 113

    iii. Change Course Proposals

- GLG 171
- GLG 172
- GRY 143

IV. Katie proposes that Kristin, herself, and anyone else who wants to, to take a look at these proposals from Geography. Take a week to make sure all of the forms fit, make sure there aren't any errors. Unanimous consent to approve these pending any errors in form just to make sure programing and wording match etc.

V. New Interdisciplinary Program: Data Science was submitted 1/29/2024. Will discuss at the next meeting.

VI. 2024-2025 Membership:

    a. Outgoing members: Christine Sudbrock (Darr), Ximena Uribe-Zarain (Edu); Jaime Gnau (MCHHS), Katie Hoegeman (RCASH)

    b. Secretary + Chair-Elect needed for next year. Volunteers?

        i. We need to decide at the March meeting. Chair-elect (chair for 2025-2026)

VII. Helena's Question to discuss: Some faculty are using open-book, online texts exams. Do we have any guidelines on how to give comments on that?

    a. Do we have guidelines?

    b. The data the faculty on their learning objectives might not be as of the same quality. How do you compare one section to another?

    c. 2 Questions?

        i. Online, open-book exams?

        ii. And different assessments across the sections?

- Similar assessments but not the same but need to address that in the course. A Pre and post Test? You don't have to have the same assessment

for every section. There is not a universal assessment, it is up to the course coordinator.

- The coordinator did exclude the data from that semester from that online exam in writing their Report.

    iii. Helena & Christie: Can the reports be automated in some way? How are you meeting these goals back to the instructor? A report can be generated from those courses that gathers those spots, to save some time? Upload things to something like Watermark? To show that there are things in place, we can see what things faculty are reporting. So that the coordinators.

    iv. Katie: The course coordinator can generate and use any data that they want, so if they want to use that and upload.

- This is outside of the purview of CGEIP . the course coordinator or the department can make and create a way of Watermark. Because it might not be beneficial for all the diverse types of courses. A department or course coordinator could definitely do that and set that up, but CGEIP shouldn't be involved in setting those things up in Watermark.

VIII.   Adjournment
    a. Next Meeting – March 6, 2024 3:30 p.m. Library 120