

**General Education Curriculum Committee  
Meeting of April 12, 2013, 2:30 p.m.**

**Minutes**

*Attending (Voting):* Biles, Desoky, Futrell, Koerselman, Mansfield-Jones, Pack, Singleton, Song, Tillquist, Zimmerman

*(Non-Voting):* Bays, Billingsley, Carden, Dietrich, Gilchrist, Karega, Reed

*(Guest):* Tomara Yohannes

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of February 22, 2013, were approved.

**CD Petition Review Update**

Karega reported that two petitions were approved, one which was an appeal.

**Assessment of Mathematics**

The Mathematics Department will be assessed on May 18. Dr. Riedel has provided the names of several readers. The results will be presented at the first GECC fall semester meeting, along with the results of the departmental assessments conducted on February 23.

**Validity Testing**

Karega met with the CEHD assessment team and Cathy Bays to determine all that the validity testing will entail. Since a rubric is being used to assess student performance, rather than testing an instrument for validity, the process will be involved and require time over the summer to complete it. She proposed that the results of the February and May assessments and the validity testing be shared in the early fall. This approach will give the GECC different ways of interpreting data and checking for consistency among raters to determine the reliability of the codes.

**\*ACTION:** Karega and Bays will draft a plan for review prior to the May meeting.

**GER and Disabilities**

Yohannes proposed that students with certain documented learning disabilities be allowed to substitute an appropriate approved course to satisfy the general education math requirement. The percentage of students who have consistent struggles with math is low but significant enough that it prevents them from graduating, even after multiple unsuccessful attempts to pass courses such as college algebra. Unfortunately, many of the despairing students give up and quit.

Zimmerman raised concern about a possible flood of non-major math students who might try to bypass the math requirement. However, the range of required testing for disabilities is rigorous and expensive and would discourage any student who simply wants to be excused from the math requirement. Zimmerman also commented that MATH 105 (Contemporary Math) requires no algebra. Desoky and Billingsley explained that students with math disabilities have difficulty

with abstraction and logic. Noble Kelly Psychological Services tests students with a suspected disability and provides a clinical spectrum of the diagnosis. Incoming students who score low on their ACT are required to take a developmental math course. Although a development course is not a sign of a learning disability, one of these students repeated MATH 065, a non-credit course, five times. Billingsley commented that Pathways instructors can recognize problems with students who attend class and try but cannot succeed, but non-UofL faculty may not know where to send these students for testing. Once tested, the DRC certifies the disability and determines its gravity. Tilquist recapped the two scenarios: 1) a documented clinical diagnosis and 2) a student who has a disability but may not be aware of it.

Billingsley is made aware of about 5-6 students each year who are desperate due to a severe disability, and he would like to see accommodations for them. In such cases, it would be important for students to be aware of their options and have a list of substitutions. If given a list of approved substitute courses, Paula Getty can work with students to determine a proper course. Billingsley recommended that UofL prepare a script similar to the one provided by The Catholic University of America and UK. To get a sense of what the students need and what the GECC wants to do, Mansfield-Jones volunteered to convene a subcommittee to explore this issue and make recommendations; Ahmed and Singleton also volunteered. A motion was made to develop a three-phase plan/process for review by the GECC: 1) Identification of struggling students, working with instructors, 2) Testing of referred students and certification of a disability based on criterion determined by the DRC, 3) Development and provision of a course substitution list to satisfy the general education requirement, but not the program requirement. **\*ACTION:** Billingsley will contact the Transfer Office to request course equivalences and descriptions for the proposed course substitution list.

### **Upcoming Meeting**

The next meeting is a luncheon at noon on May 7 at the University Club in the Bingham Library.

Prepared by Kathy Carden