

University General Education Council
September 27, 2023, 3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

Present: K. Witemeyer, J. Smith, J. Jones, D. Jackson, K. Carroll, S. Sanders, D. Kneip, L. Sharp-Penya

Absent: S. Kang, A. Pittman

Ex-officio: E. Gumm (C. Riley, C. Flanders were absent)

Guests: J. Bluitt, S. Self, C. Miertschin, Dana Kennamer, S. Jones, M. Atkinson

The meeting began at 3:30 p.m.

- Call to order by J. Smith
- Minutes from 4/26/23

No corrections, so minutes were accepted as approved.

Discussion/Action Item

1. Approval Routing Updates

J. Smith – We just approved a new general education curriculum, so things have been very busy the last few years. We are now at a place where we can look back at our purpose. We monitor quality and look at assessment in our general education courses and curriculum. We also review and update undergraduate student learning outcomes, but we don't look at this item very often. About once every ten years. We review general education curriculum requirements, which was the bulk of our work over the last couple of years. The majority of what we will be doing this year is reviewing and approving proposed changes to general education curriculum.

J. Smith – Looking at how we make decisions for general education brings us to the updates to the approval charts and the signature steps. With having two different campuses, some changes reflect only one campus, others might involve the overall ACU system. Campuses can move forward with revisions to programs and courses that only affect students at their campus. For changes that affect multiple campuses or approving new programs, we will route at the system level. Our work in the UGEC will affect students across the entire system.

C. Miertschin – If a department proposes a new course that they also wish to add to a general education menu, what is the timing on that? J. Smith – The first step is to approve the course itself at the campus level. Then we continue on to have it approved by UGEC for being added to a general education menu. We could approach this as a single item or as two separate pieces. J. Jones – My preference is that it be two separate

pieces. It would be helpful for clarity and seems logical to me. D. Kneip – I could go either way. If we decide to make it two separate processes, we could still allow both to come forward at the same time. J. Smith – I think that would work. We can have separate paperwork that can move forward at the same time, should that be desired.

J. Smith – The other significant change happens to include signatures from both campuses for all cross-listed courses. This is particularly important for general education courses, since they need to be assessed for general education outcomes. It would also make logical sense to bring both cross-listed courses to UGEC for consideration at the same time, so there might need to be some additional coordination there.

Motion to approve by D. Kneip; seconded by K. Carroll; 5 in favor; 1 abstention; motion passes.

The meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.