

**University General Education Council**  
**March 9, 2022, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**  
**Adams Center Classroom**

**Present:** K. Witemeyer, J. Smith, J. Jones, C. Flanders, M. Atkinson, R. Brown, R. Ashlock, L. Sharp-Penya

**Absent:** R. Rama, J. Prather, S. Sanders, S. Talley, K. Jang, D. Flanagan, M. Straughn

**Ex-officio:** L. May, B. Smith, E. Gumm, C. Riley (S. Macaluso was absent)

**Guests:** D. Counts, S. Self

The meeting began at 3:36 p.m.

- Call to order by J. Smith
- Prayer by R. Brown
- Minutes from 2/9/22 (Not approved with lack of quorum.)

*Action Items* (We did not have quorum, so action items were not addressed.)

1. A.A.S. General Education Requirements
2. COMM 392 – Add Capstone Designation
3. COMM 499 – Revise Capstone SLOs

*Business Item*

1. Update from Menu Criteria Teams

J. Smith - When I talked to the criteria teams I gave them a charge to decide what meets the outcome definitions and how the students can demonstrate learning. How can faculty demonstrate that the course aligns? Do we need to address all of the outcomes? What is the scope of the course, how well does it meet the criteria as an entire course? Our council as a whole will discuss guidelines that pertain to all the menus across the general education. We have some guidelines already in place. 1) It must be college-level. Developmental courses will not count for general education. 2) There should be a breadth of knowledge addressed not specific to a single major. It can be a breadth of content or a variety of content. Having menus helps with the variety. 3) Individual courses fulfill only a single general education requirement. If a course is on multiple menus, it only counts for one. 4) Any student should be able to take the course. Therefore courses free of prerequisites are preferred. It should not be particular to a single occupation or profession. We've had these guidelines in place in the past. One

new guideline was recommended by the proposal team – 5) A course may only appear on a maximum of one/two menus. In practice, we have recommended no more than two. We will need to decide as a council what limits, if any, we want to impose here.

R. Brown - SACS says the general education as a whole should represent a breadth of knowledge, not individual courses, correct? J. Smith - Right. R. Brown - So we can change the language to focus on the curriculum as a whole instead of all individual courses.

L. Sharp-Penya - When we talk about menus, does that include assigned menus? For example - Bible has its own category, but we talked about adding those courses to the humanities menu. J. Smith - That's a good question. J. Jones - The Bible courses are being assessed for Bible learning outcomes. If we add them to humanities, that adds more outcomes to those courses to assess. I don't think it is a good idea to have a single course assessing 5 or more outcomes. J. Smith - We are looking mostly at the opt-in menus for that guideline, but that is good to consider.

J. Smith - Having things ready for our next two meetings would be ideal. Each of the teams should shoot for April 4 as a deadline for establishing the criteria.

### **Humanities**

J. Jones - I'm concerned about the Humanities menu mapping to 5-6 outcomes. I think that is problematic. Mapping to 6 for any one class doesn't seem like a good idea. We might need to separate things. Could we have separate outcomes for the HIST items than the opt-in humanities menu? J. Smith - We will need to look at that mapping. We could have a Group A/Group B options for the criteria. J. Jones -If we map outcomes to history and literature, then the opt-in menu should be restricted to addressing outcomes not addressed by those other two segments. J. Smith - It could make it more difficult to populate the menu. If the opt-in menu automatically allows HIST and English literature courses, this will be a challenge. So we can look at whether or not we want to do that. To be approved on the opt-in menu, they would have to address the missing outcome plus whichever others they wish. We don't want to be too limiting, however, because we need to be sure there are plenty of seats in the courses on the menu. J. Jones - The big thing we are trying to do is to figure out how to address 6 outcomes. Our other question is whether or not courses can be on more than one menu. We might want to address how many outcomes can be mapped to a single course.

### **Science**

L. Sharp-Penya - For sciences, we have a small committee and we have a draft document put together. Our goal was to make it as concise as possible. We specified the disciplines. One of the biggest challenges was the prerequisites and corequisites required for many science courses. We came up with a way to structure the application for inclusion on the menu in a way to make it fairly easy to understand with a rubric that UGEC and other outsiders could understand. They liked the idea of having targets set for assessment without specifying assignments. Likely there would be different assignments to address each outcome. J. Smith - Spreading outcomes over multiple assignments might be something to discuss. We might be on stronger ground with SACS if we have a single

artifact. It can be a challenge to track if it is too diffuse within the course, especially when different faculty take over a course. This looks like it is on the right track, though. We might just need a little bit of defining.

### **Social and Behavioral Sciences**

R. Brown - We have a draft document. We will need to do some refinement to make it sustainable based on the discussion we just had here. We have a rubric that a department can fill out to demonstrate how a course fits the outcomes. We landed on targeting 60% of course content matching the criteria description. They need to hit 7 of 9 items on the rubric. We probably need to have a discussion on the ease of assessment and continuity of assessment. Mapping assignments to 3 different outcomes and 7 different performance indicators may be too challenging. We were thinking of spreading outcomes across multiple assignments. Our outcomes didn't really feel like they could be assessed by a single assignment. J. Smith - Maybe one assignment is too narrow, but maybe we can limit it to two. Or maybe we can simplify the rubric. J. Jones - I think a simpler system would be better. R. Brown - departments would present the completed rubric to UGEC along with the syllabus and content.

### **Cultural Literacy**

C. Flanders - This is an emotionally charged topic with diversity being a defining element. We have 6 members on our team. We deconstructed the descriptions of outcomes to try to determine our direction. We have three outcomes to address. Something that has already emerged is whether we should create discipline-specific requirements. We didn't even know if that was an option. J. Jones - Internal validity is still important. It has to measure the same learning outcome no matter where it comes from. We will also need to decide the prerequisite and level question. J. Smith - To the question of being discipline-specific, perhaps we can offer specific examples for different disciplines. C. Flanders - We won't interpret the outcome the same for different disciplines, so do we specify that on the front end or just leave it to UGEC to decide? J. Smith - Perhaps instead of locking a discipline into a set of parameters, we can give examples from different disciplines in the criteria document but give departments the freedom to choose what best fits their course. L. Sharp-Penya - I worry about examples becoming requirements. So we need to be cautious about that. C. Flanders - We have drastically different ideas on the committee about what percentage of the content should address the outcomes. Some want 10%, some want 60%. It is difficult to narrow down what is culture.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.