

University General Education Council
September 9, 2015, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Adams Center Classroom

Present: E. Gumm, G. Straughn, R. Ashlock, C. Berryhill, M. Coco, M. Garver, B. Hammack, C. Niccum, K. Pamplin, K. Pybus, P. Roggendorff, M. Smallwood, J. Wallace, P. Wertheim, J. Xu

Absent: N. Santana

Ex-officios: both were absent

Guests: C. Buck, S. Lewis

The meeting began at 3:32 p.m.

I. Call to order by E. Gumm. He then asked the council members to introduce themselves.

II. Prayer by E. Gumm.

III. Approval of the minutes from 5.6.15

Motion to approve by P. Roggendorff; seconded by J. Wallace; all in favor; none opposed; motion passes.

IV. General Education Revision Proposal

G. Straughn presented this proposal. The proposal addresses some structural changes to the general education requirements and it does three primary things: supersedes prior revisions; changes the team teaching component of CORE/BCOR courses; and it makes some substantive changes to a few menus. These are: moving CORE 210 as an option in the Cultural Awareness menu; adding a three hour historical literacy requirement (the list of courses would be developed/approved by UGEC/UUAC); moving the Fine Arts/Humanities courses to the Cultural Awareness menu in order to better control the Social Science options; raising the general education elective from 3 hours to 6 hours. There are no changes to the English, Communication, Science, Math, and Kinesiology menus. He then asked the council for questions and concerns.

K. Pamplin began by asking how many faculty positions were added to support CORE? G. Straughn answered 7-10. K. Pamplin then asked what the impact on those positions would be if this proposal is approved. G. Straughn noted that it's possible that some faculty may be dismissed by reducing CORE; however, if this proposal isn't approved then other faculty would have to be dismissed in order to fund CORE. C. Niccum asked if there is enough faculty to teach the historical literacy requirement. G. Straughn said yes. K. Pybus noted that that requirement may not be comprised of only history courses.

P. Roggendorff then brought up the foreign language component. In a previous general education revision, it was approved that all students would be required to take 6 hours of foreign language, that was later postponed and he interpreted in this proposal that it was now off the table. G. Straughn noted that a foreign language requirement did not come up with the roughly 175 faculty members he discussed this with. He also noted that other institutions (peer, state, and aspirational) do not require foreign language. He then added that a goal of this general education review was to be more transfer friendly; making 6 hours of foreign language a requirement is not transfer friendly. Increasing the general education elective to 6 hours will benefit transfer students and students who bring in dual credit hours or AP credit. P. Roggendorff then questioned why CORE 210 is being kept if it will be an option in the large Cultural Humanities menu. G. Straughn replied that that is a legitimate question and it was also brought up in the Adams Center meeting. There is a population of students for which that class is interesting and a rich experience. Dropping the course completely is too strong of a reaction. He then noted that a major feature of CORE was shooting for a high-achieving student, so we may need to meet the students where they are since the ideal honors students aren't as common as originally thought. M. Smallwood asked if they would later look at CORE 210 to see who all took it and if it was pulling away from foreign language. G. Straughn answered that that is the responsibility of the course managers. K. Pamplin then asked if department chairs could require six hours of foreign language that would fulfill the Cultural Awareness credit and the general education elective credit. E. Gumm replied that no one is currently doing that. K. Pamplin then noted that this could mean that departments aren't interested in implementing foreign language. There was then a brief discussion of the amount of courses that would be in the proposed Cultural Humanities menu. J. Wallace then noted that the demand for foreign language isn't diminished by other course options in the menu. K. Pybus asked how many courses would be in the historical literacy menu. G. Straughn said he looked into 7-8 courses not including history.

C. Niccum noted that there are two streams in play: economic and philosophical. He then asked if the changes could wait until the new vision statement was announced. S. Lewis clarified that it's strategic planning, not a new vision statement. She then said that the university strategic plan will be written in light of the academic strategic plan. G. Straughn commented that this proposal is written by considering a flexible path to graduation and multiple entry points, both of which are important to new strategic plans.

E. Gumm then noted the time (4:45) and added that the council could continue the conversation, motion to vote on the proposal as is, or motion to revise the proposal. P. Wertheim asked if they have the power to make changes or is it just a yes/no vote. E. Gumm replied that it depends on the motion, can motion to approve with certain revisions. P. Roggendorff stated that this is a practical solution to a problem but it is also tied to a larger philosophical discussion. P. Wertheim then said that if this is rejected then cuts will have to be made elsewhere; the council is comparing the potential known with an unknown. G. Straughn clarified that they are not completely out of the budget cut process; however, they cannot continue to sustain an unfunded CORE. K. Pybus then questioned if the Cultural Humanities menu should be 6 hours and the general education elective should be three hours. C. Berryhill agreed that the Cultural

Humanities menu should be 6 hours, but noted that that could be more difficult for transfer students. E. Gumm noted that being more transfer friendly is a reflection of the national conversation. There is now a greater emphasis on students' graduation within a certain timeframe and at a certain cost. M. Garver noted that the proposal looks favorable at this time given the budget constraints and the goals of being more transfer friendly and to have multiple entry points and a more flexible path to graduation.

Motion to approve as is by B. Hammack; seconded by R. Ashlock; 9 in favor; 3 opposed; 1 abstention; motion passes.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.