

University General Education Council
November 12, 2025, 3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

Present: K. Witemeyer, J. Smith, D. Kneip, L. Reed Senter, A. Randrianasolo, M. Deeg, S. Marshall, M. Isbell

Absent: A. Pittman, D. Jackson

Ex-officio: J. Jones (E. Gumm and C. Riley were absent)

Guests: D. Kennamer, K. Lee

The meeting began at 3:31 p.m.

- Call to order by J. Smith
- Minutes from 4/23/245

No corrections were presented, so minutes were accepted as approved.

Discussion Items

1. Review of 2024-25 General Education Menu Assessment Findings

J. Smith – We are looking at the performance of our student learning outcomes for our general education menus. We might look at a different format in the future that allows more comparison between years.

Submissions were stronger than last year and performance was very similar to last year.

We are in just the second year of evaluating how students are performing on the outcomes. As we look at the numbers, are there any results that cause concern or celebration?

M. Deeg – Two causes of celebration – A2 is showing about a 10 percent increase. Along with B2. The C area seems to be showing a slight decline. There also seems to be a mathematical error in Table 1. It did not add correctly for Arts & Humanities. It should be 39.5.

J. Smith – The performance on Arts & Humanities has needed some manual adjustment since we automatically accepted literature and history courses. We did not have assessments in place for those courses.

J. Smith – With outcome C, any patterns for concern or observations about those courses? With just 2 years of data, it's hard to determine the outliers. There is probably

not a reason for concern yet, but we should keep an eye on our performance for problem solving abilities.

D. Kneip – Are the life and physical science courses upper or lower-level? J. Smith – They are all lower-level. D. Kneip – I would guess that students come in thinking they will be science majors then do not find success, so they shift to a different major. J. Smith – Yes, I think that is accurate. The Life and Physical Sciences menu performance was down 6-8% compared to the other menus. We will need to decide if this is something we want to address in the future.

S. Marshall – Do we have a goal for the students? J. Smith – We do not have a target. That would be a good idea to discuss with the council as we move forward. Perhaps we will want to apply a benchmark in future. S. Marshall – Our accreditor likes for us to set a target and then show how we rate on that basis. J. Smith – I think that would be a good conversation. Often institutions look for between 70-80% success to show mastery. We are comfortably there, but we can look at increasing the expectation with a specific target.

J. Smith – With the outcomes, the diverse perspectives is the only one comfortably above the target range.

J. Smith – Any patterns of faculty submission that we are concerned about? We noted some challenges with study abroad courses. We had better participation this year overall, but there were still quite a few missing. That is a victory for this year. Eric Gumm noted that one of the courses we included was a dual credit course. Those will be difficult to get results from. There will always be one-offs. L. Reed – With the German study abroad courses, we have onboarded two local German teachers, and I worked with them over the summer to match our curriculum. So hopefully, this fall we will have a comparable system in place for assessment. J. Smith – That's great to hear.

J. Smith – You'll also see several sections of Dallas courses that show no students enrolled. We should be closing those out. From an assessment perspective, we are not concerned, but we need to stay on top of that from a course management perspective. Overall, I'm pleased with the ground we gained over the last two years.

D. Kneip – I think the Provost Office can filter the data for us and point out problem areas for the council to consider. L. Reed – It is nice to have a verbal summary and directions as well. J. Smith – I want you to have as much information as is helpful to you while not being overwhelmed. Since we are seeing more consistency with submissions, we will likely not need to continue looking at that area in future unless there are persistent problems. We want the courses that are on the menu to be showing that they are continuing to address the student learning outcomes in those courses.

J. Smith – Have you heard any feedback on the rubrics themselves? It would be a good thing to listen for comments by faculty in your areas so we can figure out if we need to make changes.

L. Reed – One report from colleagues is that there have been a time or two when large changes need to be made to courses, but there is little time to work on those during the main academic year. It would be nice if those changes could be made during the summer instead of during the fall/spring. J. Smith – I wonder if we can send reminders to faculty at the end of spring to remind them that they can work on things in the summer to have them ready for fall.

J. Smith – Recently the question of sophomore literature came up, so we are working with Cole Bennett to get assessment for Arts & Humanities in place for those courses. We are looking to do the same for History. I also met with Amanda Pitman to address additional assessment for the fourth outcome pertaining to Christian community.

The meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.