

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Minutes – January 17, 2007**

The General Education Committee met on Wednesday, January 17, 2007, from Noon to 1 p.m. in the Provost's Conference Room.

Members Present: Jim Brink (Provost's Office, ex-officio), Ray Desrosiers (Engineering), Gary Elbow (Honors), Ernest Fish (Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources), Tom Kimball (Human Sciences), Linda Krefting (Business Administration), David Lamp (Arts & Sciences), Charles Myles (Faculty Senate), Roger Saathoff (Mass Communications), David Roach (Arts & Sciences, presiding).

Members Excused: Dorothy Chansky (Visual and Performing Arts), Frank Durso (Arts & Sciences), Mellinee Lesley (Education), Ben Shacklette (Architecture)

1. Review of minutes from the last meeting. Minutes were approved.

2. Announcements.

\* Meetings Spring 2007 semester – Back to Normal Schedule: 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of month.

January 17

February 21

March 21

April 18

May – only if emergency

\* General Education Committee Chair Election – David Roach elected committee chair.

3. New Business

- Proposal from VPA School of Art to remove all ART courses from the VPA category of the GEC inventory that have prerequisites attached (to delete: 2303, 2304, 3300, 3301, 3308, 3310, 3311, 3312, 3313, 3314, 3315, 3316, 3317, 3319, 3321, 3322, 3323, 3324, 3325, 3326, 3328, 3329, 3330, 3331, 3333, 3334, 3336, 3337, 3338, 3339, 4104, 4304, 4310, 4311, 4312, 4313, 4314, 4315, 4318, 4320, 4322, 4326, 4328, 4329, 4330, 4334, 4335, 4338—48 courses).

**The committee voted to recommend approval of these course deletions.**

4. Old Business

- *December Meeting Issue: dropping 3000 and 4000 courses that have prerequisites that fulfill general education requirements off of the core list. A motion was made and seconded that all 3000 and 4000 level courses in the core that have prerequisites that fulfill general education requirements be removed from the core list. The motion was tabled to allow time for university departments to share input and responses to this motion. Roach sent an email to Deans with news of this pending motion, so that they can get responses from departments. Previous feedback from History and English.*  
**Received feedback from Literature Division of English, Ag. & Applied Economics, CMLL, and Philosophy.**  
**Committee discusses feedback. Some confusion about proposal evident in responses. Committee decides to send out another message, explaining the proposal more clearly and inviting feedback before the next meeting. Roach will send this to Deans and Associate Deans to be distributed to departments. Original proposal tabled until next meeting.**
- *December Meeting Issue: A motion was made and seconded that current statements in the core that give collections of courses automatic inclusion in the core should be removed. The rationale for the motion is that in view of increased accountability and SACS requirements, the committee is charged even more to review individual courses, not categories of courses. Core Curriculum Learning Outcome and Assessment data has to be monitored and gathered on individual courses. With the new 5 year review cycle for all General Education courses, all departments will have to send in Learning Outcome and Assessment data for each individual course. The motion was tabled to allow time for university departments to share input on this motion if they so desire. Roach sent an email to Deans with news of this pending motion, so that they can get responses from departments before a decision is made. This issue will be revisited in the 1<sup>st</sup> spring committee meeting, with the goal of making a final decision at that meeting.*  
**Committee discusses and votes to recommend to Provost that current catalog statements in the core that give collections of courses automatic inclusion in the core should be removed from the catalog.**
- *Discussion this fall of GEC role in writing intensive courses. Committee to engage in discussion of how to enhance Writing Intensive requirement on campus. WI Question received: "Does this mean 6 hours of architecture classes or 2 required courses in the degree that can be in any college (like 6 hours of English*

courses)? **Committee discussion.** The “spirit of the law” is that writing intensive courses should be in the discipline. Students need to know that writing skills have direct relevance in their own discipline. Students need to know that writing is valued in the field. The committee recommends to the Provost that “in the specific area of study” be added to the writing intensive requirement paragraph (p. 50) for the 07-08 catalog.

- LOs and Assessments for Gen Ed courses - Gil emailed the following comments: There is a “need to better articulate what the college-level general education competencies should be for each category. At this time, such competencies (expected learning outcomes) are not clearly stated for the various general education categories. Given the current national-level discussions on accountability, the ability of universities to accurately document that our students are achieving these college-level knowledge, skills, and abilities (i.e., competencies) is growing in importance. The work of the General Education Committee in providing evidence that our graduates have attained these general education competencies is critical. Some institutions are adopting national competency exams such as the CLA and/or the NSSE to provide supporting evidence that their students are attaining specific general education competencies. Others are using “embedded assessments” that focus on the expected learning outcomes as documented within the general education courses but this is not simply doing individual course assessments.”  
**Committee discussed general education learning outcomes and assessments in view of this.**

**\*\*\* Subsequent to the meeting, the Provost approved the recommendations regarding ART course deletions, removing statements about inclusion of collections of courses from the catalog, and adding “in the specific area of study” wording to the writing intensive wording in the catalog.\*\*\*\***

---

NOTE THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES FOR PROPOSALS  
TO THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE:

- Proposals for changes in the Core Curriculum must come to the General Education Committee (GEC) from the office of the dean of the originating college and with an indication of the dean’s approval. Proposals not bearing the approval of the dean’s office will be returned to the college without action.
- *Proposals to add or delete a course from the Core must be accompanied by a current syllabus and supporting materials. Proposals must clearly demonstrate how the proposed course fits the specific Core Curriculum category description. The course syllabus must include:*
  - 1) *a course description.*
  - 2) *course objectives.*
  - 3) *learning outcomes and assessments that are clearly tied to the specific Core Curriculum category.*
  - 4) *a schedule of class meetings and topics to be covered.**Proposals not accompanied by a syllabus will be returned to the college without action. Supporting materials need to include assessment data and information on how this assessment data is being used to inform how the class is being taught.*
- To ensure that proposals are considered at a meeting of the GEC, they should arrive in the Provost’s office (attention: Brink) no later than the beginning of the month during which they will come before the GEC. Proposals that do not arrive by this deadline may be considered, depending on the number of items on the agenda for the meeting. If late proposals cannot be included on the agenda for the meeting, they will be considered at the next meeting.
- Sponsorship of proposals is done by the GEC representative of the originating college. The presence of additional sponsors is neither necessary nor desirable unless specifically invited by the committee. GEC recommends that proposers consult with their college’s representative on the GEC.