

University General Education Council
February 25, 2026, 3:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Zoom Meeting

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

Absent: L. Reed Senter, D. Jackson

Ex-officio: E. Gumm, J. Jones (C. Riley was absent)

Guests: W. Crawford, G. Straughn, L. Sharp-Penya, S. Jones

The meeting began at 3:31 p.m.

- Call to order by J. Smith
- Minutes from 11/25/2025

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

Action Items

1. MUSM 236 – Add to A&H and CL Menus

G. Straughn – This course is designed to be taught in Leipzig. There are very rich musical offerings there. This would be in line with literature courses tied to Oxford, etc. Students will attend concerts and reflect. Leipzig is a rich place for classical music and very cross-cultural.

J. Smith – Both applications are in this single document. D. Kneip – Is there any concern with this being on two menus? J. Smith – We do have courses on multiple menus. We did limit that to two menus. D. Kneip – Given that the non-western aspect of Bach Fest varies from year-to-year, do you see any trouble meeting those cultural literacy goals? G. Straughn – Matt has been more connected to the development of this course. If there were ever a situation where we looked at the offerings at Bach Fest and felt they were not broad enough, the instructor would take the students to Prague or other places where there are more opportunities. D. Kneip – I know they put out the schedule well in advance, so there is plenty of time to plan.

J. Smith – Regarding assessments, do you have more information on specific assignments? G. Straughn – The nature of those reflection assignments would be prompts used in Canvas. If the council wishes us to have a narrower artifact for a particular written assignment. J. Smith – I would like to have it specified in a little more detail so the instructor will know what to submit for assessment.

Motion to approve by D. Kneip; seconded by A. Randrianasolo; all in favor, motion passed.

2. MUSM 131 – Change from 2 hrs to 3 hrs (A&H and CL Menus)

J. Smith – AUAC has already approved the change of the hours. G. Straughn – The main addition to the class in the inclusion of content related to popular music. Three hours makes it much easier for students to use for gen ed credit. D. Kneip – The 100-level course is more for music majors, correct? G. Straughn – Yes. E. Gumm – The two credit hours caused problems for students, so this is an improvement.

Motion to approve by M. Deeg; seconded by A. Randrianasolo; all in favor, motion passed.

3. MUSM 132 – Close Course, Remove from A&H Menu

J. Smith – AUAC has already approved the closing of this course. G. Straughn – We are creating some new courses that will fill this niche in our major.

Motion to approve by D. Kneip; seconded by A. Pittman; all in favor, motion passed.

4. SOCI 380 – Close Course, Remove from CL Menu

J. Smith – These courses have been closed by AUAC. L. Sharp-Penya – This is due to the Sociology program being closed. We do have a Sociology Minor, but these courses are not used in that minor.

5. SOCI 415 – Close Course, Remove from SBS Menu

See above.

Motion to approve items 4-5 by S. Marshall; seconded by M. Deeg; all in favor, motion passed.

Discussion Items

6. Oversight of updating gen ed menu assessment plans

J. Smith – Gen ed courses are adopted and their alignment to the menus is examined. Courses, however, are living things and are regularly revised. We have questions from faculty members about how to update their assessment plans. We don't have a process for that. How do we want to handle those situations? We also have cross-listed courses that come from Dallas that are equivalent to existing menu options. Do you want faculty to simply file their assessment plans with us or does the council want to review those?

D. Kneip – I definitely think that new courses should come through council for review. For revisions, that could create a lot of work for a faculty council. Perhaps the Provost's

Office could handle that unless there is a question about an item that could be brought to UGEC for review. A. Pittman – I agree about the workload getting heavy very quickly. Is there a way to quantify the degree of change? Switching one essay prompt for another with the same rubric wouldn't need review, but if an entirely new assignment is proposed, that might be something to bring to the council for discussion.

J. Smith – There is a range of options for us. There is not an item on the approval chart currently. An administrative review could be possible. We would want to establish a criteria to use. Another item would be to create them as information items for this council. They would be available to see but wouldn't require a vote. D. Kneip – Information items make sense as far as transparency. In terms of criteria, if there is a significant reduction in the quantity or quality of the assignment that might warrant a review. Large differences would raise a flag and possibly prompt a review.

J. Smith – I'm not sure what the volume of this will be. For now, I will gather the changes and provide them as information items. We can call out issues we see regarding quantity and quality of assignments. D. Kneip – Would it be helpful for us to craft a memo to the Provost's Office to outline what we are looking for? I would be willing to volunteer. J. Smith – I think that would be very helpful. We would address it to Academic Affairs since they oversee both campuses.

7. Discuss menu coverage – J. Smith – These are questions I would like you to ask your fellow faculty members, especially in departments with heavy involvement in general education.
 - a. Are there courses that you see missing from the menus?
 - b. Are there courses that faculty report being overburdened by the amount of outcomes or reporting?

The meeting adjourned at 4:14 p.m.