

University General Education Council
September 14, 2022, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

Present: K. Witemeyer, J. Smith, J. Jones, K. Carroll, S. Talley, R. Brown, M. Atkinson, T. Naldoza, S. Sanders, L. Sharp-Penya, R. Ashlock

Absent: R. Rama

Ex-officio: B. Reeves, M. Allen, G. Mihills, E. Gumm, C. Riley

Guests: D. Counts, S. Self, B. Ries, D. Kennamer

The meeting began at 3:31 p.m.

- Call to order by J. Smith
- Minutes from 4/27/22

Motion to approve the minutes by S. Talley; seconded by J. Jones. 6 in favor; 2 abstentions. Minutes approved.

Discussion Items

1. Council Responsibilities

J. Smith - We have ten faculty members on the council this year. We are moving online to allow for our colleagues from Dallas to join. The faculty senate has reviewed the membership of the committees and made a few changes. This was originally a double-representation council for each college, yet it did not include representatives from CGPS. In an effort to reduce the faculty burden, they decided to reducing the representation number. We will have nine members moving forward. We have ten this year as we wait for terms to expire.

Our council is in charge of making decisions regarding general education. In the past, items would also be approved by UUAC, but moving forward, that step will be eliminated.

2. General Education Implementation Plan

J. Smith – Faculty have been working on their proposals. Friday, September 16 will be the deadline to have those submitted for consideration to populate our menus. We will have a very busy start to our semester. There may be other courses that wish to be considered in the future, but what we are aiming to do is to determine by the first week of November how the menus will be populated so that our programs can have time to revise and restructure their degree plans. Those degree plan revisions will go through council in the spring. This means we will need to make timely progress. It might be a good idea to familiarize yourself with the guidelines and applications for each menu.

There are more than 100 courses on the menus currently. I don't expect that we will have that same number. However, we will have a significant number of applications to consider. Please review them ahead of time and come with questions prepared in advance to allow for maximum efficiency.

Action Item

1. AAS General Education Proposal – Revised

J. Smith – We discussed this proposal in our council last spring. It comes to us now with some significant revisions. We are looking at a corporate partnership to offer a degree of this type. Our focus is not to approve the degree, but to determine what the general education requirements should be for this new degree type. Our new general education plan for bachelor degrees gives us a good framework to apply here. If we want to offer a program for an Associate's of Applied Studies program, that would need to be approved by all appropriate levels. However, the faculty first need to know what the general education requirements would be for such a degree. In the presenting case, it would be a program in nursing. If there would be such a degree, what would those requirements be? That is our duty to decide.

Last year, the proposal was for 15 hours with the vocational formation courses fulfilling the Bible requirements. The proposal has now moved to 18 hours with the additional requirement of BIBL/BIBO 101. The BIBV courses would move to the Humanities menu. We also include more of the narrative of how this discussion developed.

J. Jones – The inclusion of BIBV on the Humanities menu was something that the committee was resistant to. They will not want to set this precedent. B. Ries – I would not describe these as Bible courses but as a focus on personal giftedness and work. There is theology, but it is a more holistic approach. J. Smith – In approving to add BIBV on the Humanities menu, it would not add these courses to the other Arts & Humanities menu for the main general education.

T. Naldoza – Will this make it a 63-hour degree? J. Smith – We are aiming for 60 hours, but it is likely it will move to 63 hours with the additional gen ed hours. R. Brown – So even though the menus are different, we are still using the same outcomes. Is that correct? J. Smith – Yes, but we would expect that not everything will be addressed to the same degree. T. Naldoza – Most programs in benchmarking have 25-28 gen ed vs. nursing courses. S. Self – We don't actually know what the additional required hours will be. We are providing a foundation. We will not take away from the courses needing to be offered in the core program. This is not all of the general education coursework, these are just the basic requirements. There might be more sciences, for example, needed for the Nursing program. J. Smith – It is a challenge to only consider part of the puzzle. We aren't just counting every non-nursing course as general education.

S. Sanders – How will the testing happen for English, for example? S. Self – We currently have a minimum standard. If they can't meet the ENGL 106 standard, we don't

have a developmental course available. We are looking into development of that. But yes, they will need to test in.

R. Brown – In the proposal as stated, there is not a chance to address student outcome B on diversity. That seems to be a hole. Maybe this could be filled with BIBV, but that puts a lot of pressure on those courses. J. Smith – Would it address the concern to require the courses on the Humanities menu to address this outcome? R. Brown – If we could say that the Humanities menu courses are addressing outcome B, then I would be fine with that. S. Talley – When I look at those BIBV courses, there are places to work that in. J. Smith – As a reminder, these courses are not yet developed or approved, so we have some room to adjust. B. Ries – I think it is possible to do. R. Brown – We have good mapping for the BS and BA. I would like to see the same thing for this degree. J. Smith – The others are similar, so the mapping is in place. We just need to be sure the Humanities menu as it is outlined here can be mapped to the diversity outcome.

T. Naldoza – No 4 four-year university offer both BSN and AAN programs. I'm a little worried as this moves forward, since we don't have anyone from Nursing on the AUAC council. J. Smith – If we are going to offer a program at the Abilene council, it would come through AUAC. If we are going to offer an AAS program on the Dallas campus, it would come through CGPS council. We would not have the main campus offer both the BSN and AAS. We would have two different campuses offering two different degree types. T. Naldoza – How would this affect the pre-Nursing online program? J. Smith – Right now, nothing that we are considering would change the programs currently in existence. T. Naldoza – What happens if there are future roadblocks? J. Smith – It's possible that we are approving something that never comes to fruition. This is a preliminary step. And that is fine. There could be questions that come up that lead us to decide this is not a fruitful option, but that is not the impression we've received so far.

L. Sharp-Penya – If the AAS general education is approved, and the Dallas council moves the program through their council without any input from the Abilene BSN program, how do we address idea of that program competing with the BSN program? J. Smith – This process is no different than the process we have used for the last several years with the Dallas council. As for the competition question, these are two programs that do different things with different audiences. The specific population is so distant from Abilene, that they would never choose to be educated residentially. If we were talking about another BSN, I think competition would be an appropriate discussion. But this population is for people in full-time jobs who cannot leave their situation to further their education, so for the AAS degree, the competition does not exist.

Motion to approve the AAS general education requirements with the caveat that the Humanities menu courses be mapped to SLO B2 for Diversity by R. Brown, seconded by S. Talley. 6 in favor; 2 opposed; 1 abstain; motion passes.

The meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.