

**General Education Curriculum Committee 2004-05
Meeting of September 13, 2004 - 2:00 p.m.**

Minutes

Voting Members Attending: Ann Allen, Susan Crim, Richard Dugger, Mark French, Karen Gray, Sarah Hester (student rep), Carol Holloman, Avery Kolers (Chair), Babu Nahata, David Schultz, Bill Weinberg, Beth Willey, Wiley Williams
Others: Dale Billingsley (non-voting), Kathy Carden (staff).

1. Kolers called the meeting to order, and members of the committee introduced themselves.
2. Carden distributed a General Education Reference Manual to each member and gave a quick overview of the order of the documents, most of which can be found on the general education website. Tabs for the minutes and agenda/handouts allow for continual updates.
3. Billingsley/Kolers summarized the function of the committee in three major focus areas:
 - approval of courses to meet general education requirements
 - development of assessment process
 - recommendation of solutions to meet course demands

*Kolers proposed that the full committee divide up into working subcommittees to address each of these areas. The committee approved this motion. Following critical review by the subcommittees, recommendations will be presented to the full committee for approval.

Billingsley further commented on the policy on transfer equivalencies and allocation of general education credits (see handout). There may be a problem in the CD requirement area with transfers. *An authoritative mechanism needs to be in place to officially answer various policy questions that arise (substitutions/waivers for general education requirements, unit uniformity on grading policies such as pass/fail courses, etc.). There is a question of who should have jurisdiction.

4. The committee (GECC) elected Avery Kolers as the 2004-05 Chair.
5. Billingsley reported that the new SACS requirements focus on undergraduate education and student learning outcomes, and that general education is a key area that SACS will evaluate. The first round of SACS reviews (an accreditation compliance report) does not entail a visit; the second study does involve a SACS team visit

(January/February 2007). The GECC will need expertise assistance (within the university) to develop an assessment process. The task will require a baseline study (none to date) with noted improvements based on evaluation. Weinberg suggested starting with student outcomes reports. An initiative must be in place soon.

*Billingsley will invite Dan Mahony, Assistant University Provost in charge of institutional assessment, to share pertinent information on the accreditation process, principles, and goals at the next GECC meeting.

Note: The proposed letter to general education faculty to survey assessment measures that may already be in place is *still pending* (reference minutes of May 10, 2004).

6. Kolers discussed the growing course demands problem. During the past spring, Boyd's management students were involved in a class project to try to diagnose underlying problems and pinpoint some solutions. Following the initial findings, a subcommittee will make recommendations on ways to address the issue. Some preliminary suggestions include: encouragement of faculty to teach general education courses (incentives), variance of class times (juggling of faculty), and expansion of available sections (facilities issue). Class size was also discussed.

*Kolers will ask Boyd to report on the CRT analysis as soon as possible.

Note: Billingsley referenced the docushare site of unmet demands by GER requirement area (see last tab in binder). One example of course shortages is with the OC requirement. The standard entry-level course, COMM 111, started out w/ 1,000 seats but dwindled down to only 60 seats by the end of May.

7. The meeting adjourned with a call for service on one of the three subcommittees.

Kathy Carden, recorder