

**University General Education Council
February 10, 2016, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Adams Center Classroom**

Present: N. Santana, P. Roggendorff, K. Hendrick, E. Gumm, G. Straughn, J. Wallace, M. Lynn, M. Smallwood, J. Xu, K. Pybus, C. Niccum, R. Ashlock, K. Pamplin, M. Garver, B. Hammack

Absent: P. Wertheim,

Ex-officios: T. Milholland (T. Lee absent)

Guests: Kari Hatfield, Ron Morgan, Dawn Meeks

The meeting began at 3:31 p.m.

I. Call to order by E. Gumm.

II. Prayer by M. Lynn.

III. Approval of the minutes from 1.13.16

K. Pamplin – Should it be criterion instead of criteria? M. Lynn – Criterion is singular.
E. Gumm – So yes, the numbered criteria should be changed to read criterion.

Motion to approve with above change by K. Hendrick; seconded by N. Santana; all in favor; none opposed; motion passes.

Information Item

IV. Discussion of wording to be added to the criteria for University Requirements menu items regarding criteria assessment.

E. Gumm – We have struggled over the last several years to incorporate an assessment piece to the university requirements menu criteria. We use the criteria to evaluate a course to see if it will be allowed on the menu. After it is on the list, we must assess the overall general education competencies and student learning outcomes in order for it to remain on the list. How does this course contribute to achieving these competencies? Each department would need to address how they plan to assess these competencies. We need this type of mapping for each of our university requirements menus. This is the annual reporting requirement. (See example sheet.) J. Wallace – Are we going to have software to do this online? E. Gumm – We are planning to utilize Task Stream for this. G. Straughn – We have done some consolidation and standardization inside Task Stream to try to make this easy to implement. It should not require any additional work.

E. Gumm – These new criteria would replace what is currently listed on the blog. N. Santana – I find this example very useful. Maybe we can distribute this to departments

to help them understand how to complete this report. M. Lynn – How will this data be used? G. Straughn – The results must be contextually examined to reflect different class sections, etc. K. Pamplin – Is it necessary to look at sections? E. Gumm – Not for this particular competency. We are looking at the menu as a whole. If we find that the menu as a whole is not meeting the competency, we can then look at individual courses. M. Lynn – We need to think how this data plays all the way out. E. Gumm – It is at the student level that we are committed to at this point.

K. Pamplin – If we are saying 85% met this goal, but in Task Stream, we only have "met" or "not met" as options – you're not going to be able to differentiate the percentage. T. Millholland – Task Stream is looking at an aggregate level not at the detailed level. E. Gumm – The piece that is missing in these document is the results. Results should include number of students in the course and the percentage of students who met the goal. That will give us the numbers we need. We can add that to the results box on the example that we distribute. M. Lynn – What about the feedback? G. Straughn – That's why we are trying to standardize the format to make that feedback easier to compile and distribute.

E. Gumm – We will need to discuss at a future meeting the combining of the Cultural Awareness/Fine Arts menu criteria.

Action Items

V. Inclusion of HIST 117, 118, 131, and 250 on the Cultural Awareness Menu

E. Gumm – If you will recall, the faculty vote removed these from the Cultural Awareness menu. History is proposing that we add them back in. C. Niccum – There is a numbering question – HIST 250 and 240 are both listed on the documentation. R. Morgan – HIST 250 is the correct number. B. Hammack – Are we disregarding the faculty vote? J. Wallace – No. We are reintroducing these as a new item. I talked to some people who might have felt that way, and they felt good about this process. P. Roggendorff – Do we have other instances where there is one single course in multiple menus? E. Gumm – There are some, yes. History and Music courses, Anthropology, Global Studies, Bible courses. Not a large number, but there are a few. R. Morgan – The faculty vote wasn't specifically about removing HIST courses from the Cultural Awareness menu, it was a vote on the new outline of CORE as a whole. The courses still fit in these other menus, and we are looking for student flexibility. Having these multiple points of entry gives the students more flexibility.

Motion to approve by K. Pamplin; seconded by M. Lynn; 12 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention; motion passes.

VI. Inclusion of HIST courses on the Historical Literacy Menu (HIST 117, 118, 131, 221, 222, and 250)

Ron Morgan – For example, HIST 221 – The first three criteria are a given with all History faculty. The fourth criterion is something that some of us have done, others not

as much. But we've addressed this with adjustments to the syllabi, creating new assignments to fulfill this specific criterion. As a department, we made a point to create assignments to address each of these criteria. K. Pamplin – I'm looking at HIST 221, are we looking at solidifying these measurements to the detail of number of tests, detailed assignments, etc.? R. Morgan – We are committing to the Student Learning Outcomes, the measurement column is just an example of how it is currently being measured. K. Pamplin – Are we locking into these measurements by approving this proposal? E. Gumm – This council is just approving that the course meets the criteria set up for inclusion on the Historical Literacy menu, not to the method of assessment. G. Straughn – The requirement to meet the competency doesn't change, but the type of measurement can change for each course, each professor. K. Pamplin – Our committee doesn't need to look at such finite details. P. Roggendorff – If the assessment is at the menu level, there must be standardized acceptable and ideal goal levels since the menu items cross many departments. E. Gumm – Let's table that for another time, and just look at the inclusion of these courses on the menu for now.

Motion by P. Roggendorff that HIST 117, 118, 131, 221, 222, and 250 be approved for inclusion on the Historical Literacy menu; seconded by C. Niccum; all in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstention; motion passes.

VII. Inclusion of THEA 490 on the Historical Literacy Menu

Dawn Meeks - This course covers a span from Greek History to contemporary times. We have a variety of projects, so students are writing and personally reflecting on historical components. We are looking at how theatre is influenced by history – war, religious practice, gender statements, etc. How playwrights are influenced by their times. C. Niccum – Are there any prerequisites? Kari Hatfield – Yes. Intro to Theatre. It is a junior/senior level course. E. Gumm – Is it majors only? K. Hatfield – Majors and minors. We can have up to 35 students in the course. E. Gumm – This is your writing intensive course, correct? K. Hatfield – Yes.

E. Gumm – If you look at the criteria document, the overall definition of general education states that "Courses that satisfy ACU's University Requirements (General Education) will normally have lower-level numbering, be free of prerequisites and co-requisites, appeal to more than one or two majors, and 'not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession' (SACS 2.7.3)." The department can ask for an exception. This would have to be an exception according to those broad university requirements definitions. K. Hatfield – The types of students who ask to take this course who are not our majors tend to be Education and English and Communication, students who are looking for master's level work or anticipating career needs and licensing exams. We still require students to meet the prerequisites. Majors and minors are served first, but if a student meets the prerequisites, they will be able to enter the class.

M. Lynn – I can see an exception being made since majors like theatre and education have so little flexibility in their degree plan and that 128 hour cap. G. Straughn – Yes. I would like to advocate for this course be included for just that reason. I think it provides

more flexibility for students in these programs. K. Pybus – But these overall criteria limit us somewhat. No department other than History would have a lower level course that would fit in this menu. K. Pamplin – We have to have consistency across the board. T. Milholland – For SACS, it seems to violate your stated policies, though you do have room for an exception. There are ways around it, but I would encourage the committee to tighten the language. We don't want a department to have their own upper-level, majors-only courses approved just so their majors can have a required course fulfill a general education requirement. C. Niccum – My concern is for the writing intensive side as well. E. Gumm – There is a precedent with some upper level courses (FIN 419) being on the Cultural Awareness menu and having prerequisites. J. Wallace – This course violates all the criteria. N. Santana – But they can have an exception. J. Wallace – To *all* the criteria? P. Roggendorff – Why are you asking for an exception? K. Hatfield – Because it is such a tight major. We are looking for ways to help our students. G. Straughn – We voted on the Historical Literacy requirement that did not include the preamble we are debating here. I would suggest we alter the wording to allow a broader definition to allow for more flexibility.

K. Pamplin – Can we resolve a writing-intensive course that says is specific to a major with the SACS definition of not being narrowly focused? T. Milholland – So this is a major required course, which makes it problematic as defining it as a general education course. K. Hatfield – We have about 2 non-majors per class. M. Lynn – Do we need to define what “normally” means in the General Education definition? G. Straughn – Looking at Texas Tech – In their Humanities menu, there are scores of courses at the 400 level.

C. Niccum – I move we table this until we decide what should be allowed. P. Roggendorff – I second the motion.

Motion to table the discussion by C. Niccum; seconded by P. Roggendorf; all in favor; motion passes.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.