

Undergraduate General Education Council
May 6, 2015, 3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Adams Center Classroom

Present: E. Gumm, G. Straughn, R. Ashlock, L. Baker, C. Flanagan, M. Garver, B. Hammack, D. Perkins, C. Niccum, J. Nichols, P. Roggendorff, M. Smallwood, N. Santana

Absent: K. Pamplin, P. Wertheim, J. Xu

Ex-officios: T. Milholland

Guests: J. Arrington, S. Jones, S. Lewis

The meeting began at 3:35 p.m.

I. Call to order by G. Straughn

II. Prayer

III. Approval of the minutes from 3.25.15 and 4.8.15

Motion to approve by J. Nichols; seconded by N. Santana; all in favor; none opposed; motion passes.

IV. Include ENGR 350 in the Social Science menu

The council discussed their concerns of the prerequisites for this course. M. Garver asked about the likelihood that students besides Engineering majors will take this class. J. Arrington said it is hard to predict what freshmen and sophomores will do. P. Roggendorff expressed concern that the liberal arts education is being undermined. J. Arrington said that the department would not have proposed this course for a general education menu if they didn't think it would actually fit. It takes similar topics as other general education courses but looks at them through a different lens. G. Straughn pointed out that ACU's Social Science menu is a small fraction of what other schools (TAMU, TTU, etc.) have. He then mentioned that we could return to degree specific general education menus. This course is a flavor of economics, which is similar to how International Business fits into the Cultural Awareness menu and a degree plan menu. B. Hammack stated that it's difficult for her students to get into some general education classes because all students are filling the spots, and the general education courses may have conflicting times with majors' classes. She understands why Engineering is bringing this forward. D. Perkins said he'd rather waive the Social Science requirement for Engineering majors than call this course a Social Science. C. Niccum asked how this course meets criterion 2.b. J. Arrington replied that it deals with corporate entities (organizations) as well as political and economic systems.

Motion to approve by B. Hammack; seconded by C. Flanagan; four in favor; four opposed; three abstentions; G. Straughn and E. Gumm both voted in favor to break the tie; motion passes.

V. Engineering capstone: ENGR 430 and 432

J. Arrington began by stating that the capstone is a yearlong sequence; the first semester is focused on design and the definition of the problem, the second semester is focused on models, testing, and writing reports. G. Straughn noted that ENGR 430 is a prerequisite for ENGR 432, and that this is standard practice for Engineering. These courses align with ABET criteria; the course also has a faith and learning component, an annotated vita, and a writing intensive component. J. Arrington said that the vita piece is within the scope of each project. J. Nichols asked about the “dress for success” week on the course schedule. J. Arrington said that some students are unprepared for the professional side of being an engineer. To combat that, they focus on professional aspects, for example, customers come to campus, which gives student professional experience; they don’t anticipate having an entire week spent on dress. G. Straughn ended by saying that the capstone outcomes are split between the two courses.

Motion to approve by J. Nichols; seconded by M. Garver; all in favor; none opposed; motion passes.

VI. New course: PEAC 101

E. Gumm began by saying UUAC passed this course unanimously. M. Garver (who’s taught the course as ST) said that students have the freedom to exercise how they choose. The class only meets a handful of times throughout the semester; they use tracking programs to log their exercise time. N. Santana asked if study abroad students would utilize this course. S. Jones replied that study abroad usually uses Walking for Fitness. C. Flanagan asked if athletes could get credit for their team workouts for this class. S. Jones replied that they already get credit for team workouts with Strength Training, so they probably couldn’t get credit for this as well.

Motion to approve for the PEAC menu by D. Perkins; seconded by P. Roggendorff; all in favor; none opposed; motion passes.

VII. KINE 420 (capstone) variable credit proposal

S. Jones presented this proposal. The Kinesiology and Nutrition department wants KINE 420 to be a variable credit. It’s currently a six hour course with 320 observation hours. That’s ok for the Health Promotion track, but that is too many observation hours for the PT, OT, and new AT tracks. E. Gumm noted that the course competencies and outcomes are not changing; this is only an adjustment for field hours.

This item was information only.

VIII. Faculty Survey Discussion

G. Straughn began by stating that he attempted to collate the survey information visually. The narrative answers are on the UGEC blog. There are twin concerns regarding the CORE budget and its implementation. The pressure to reduce the overall hours from 128 is not something the faculty thinks is important; there's good reason to stay at 128 hours because of block tuition and the large number of hours students transfer in. Faculty and students feel that CORE is important. G. Straughn noted that there were a few issues with the survey; it's highly contextualized because of the earlier budget discussion; there also weren't answer options for "I don't know" or "not applicable," which could explain some of the responses. There was general support for creating a historical literacy piece in the "general education elective" as well as to expand the Communication menu. Others thought the 2 PEAC hours should be eliminated. Regarding cutting CORE, some responders thought CORE 110 should remain but the other two should be eliminated; however, the largest percentage was to cut BCOR 310 and keep the other two CORE courses. There was also frustration with the lack of funding for CORE, which was apparent in the survey responses. He then said that there should be a presentation to the faculty about this in the fall; it may be a part of faculty pre-session. He asked the council to think about this over the summer, as well as whether or not ACU should return to the more traditional general education plan. L. Baker asked about the timeline for this decision. G. Straughn said that UGEC should make a recommendation in the fall and the faculty would vote in late Fall, so whatever is voted on would go into effect in fall 2016.

He then acknowledged that this has been a difficult semester for this committee due to the large number of frank conversations that have happened.

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.