

**General Education Curriculum Committee  
Meeting of October 10, 2008, 3:00 p.m.**

**Minutes**

*Attending (Voting):* Beattie, Busch, Cox, Downs, Futrell, Jones, Karpoff, Koerselman, Maron, Martin, Singleton, Weinberg, Williams, Zimmerman, *(Non-Voting):* Billingsley, Carden, Dietrich, Robinson, Steinberg

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of September 12, 2008 were approved.

Course Proposal Subcommittee

Volunteers to serve on the course proposal subcommittee include: Bronwyn Williams, Sam Jones (student rep), Bill Weinberg and Arnold Karpoff.

\*Action: Carden will staff the subcommittee and schedule the meeting to review course proposals as soon as possible after the November 15 course proposal deadline.

Update on Assessment

Robinson and Billingsley discussed the hold up on the Natural Sciences assessment. It's a similar problem that surfaced during the Mathematics assessment when "lay" readers and mathematics readers scored papers differently. Since readers across the disciplines may not review NS papers with the same mastery as those in the sciences, it's been suggested by the NS chairs that the rubric be styled differently and/or that an adjustment be made in the way that readers are chosen.

Regarding future assessments in mathematics, Maron commented that a word problem may be a solution, as well as an open-ended question. The current mathematics rubric was constructed following the critical thinking (CT) model. Regarding the question of who is qualified to assess, CEHD could be approached for possible readers.

Billingsley reminded the GECC that "actual graded assignments" are used in the assessments. Any modifications to the rubric for Natural Sciences must be reviewed by the chairs and then distributed to faculty prior to the design of their courses (the syllabi), which means before the end of this fall term.

Discussion on various possibilities (use of lab reports with a writing component, the following of certain general concept/department-wide criteria in the critical thinking rubric, etc.) led to a suggestion that a subcommittee be formed to review the current CT rubric.

\*Action: Zimmerman, Karpoff and Maron indicated that they were willing to assist with the rubric review.

Dietrich asked if the cycle of assessment would be completed in the spring and then repeated. Also, after the first round of assessments, she wondered what could be reported about the success of the general education program in meeting the criteria and what could be done to improve performance. Robinson commented that a number of departments have requested their results. Koerselman strongly suggested recognizing departments that are doing an exceptional job in meeting goals.

\*Action: Changes to the original agreement with units to not identify individual departments would need to be renegotiated if the GECC votes to provide reports during the next round of assessments.

Billingsley explained that the I2A assessment (targeted for Spring 2009) goes beyond general education into the majors. That assessment is being modeled after the general education assessment rubrics. Those who are familiar with the rubrics can be of assistance in that project.

### Course Equivalencies - Transfers

In response to a question about course substitutions/equivalencies, Steinberg distributed two general education checklists – one outlining the 41-hour requirement for native UofL students and one outlining the 33-hour core requirements set by the state for block transfers. Since the CD competency is not required at all state institutions for general education certification, the committee discussed whether CD credit should be required for graduation, including transfer students. Currently, some departments are requiring 6 hours of CD credit and some are not. The Office of Admissions evaluates equivalencies for transfer students and checks off the requirements that are met but is not a gate keeper for graduation (does not attach hours). It was the consensus of the committee, with some concerns noted by Nursing, that a standard rule be set for all students. If required, Dietrich stressed the need to make CD courses available; Billingsley noted that the only CD courses that fill up quickly are those that double count. Jones commented that some juniors and seniors wait to fulfill the CD requirement after their prerequisites are met. Regarding the issue of competitiveness in the field of nursing and the desire by Martin not to initiate barriers for returning students, it was noted that transfer students could request the evaluation of a course (for review by the GECC or a subcommittee) that may satisfy a CD equivalency; the goal is that all students experience CD course work. A motion was made and approved to make six hours of CD a graduation requirement.

\*Action: Billingsley will take this recommendation to the UG Council; if approved, it will go forward to the levels of the Faculty Senate and the Provost for consideration.

Koersleman raised the question of the number of students who graduate without CD credit.

\*Action: Billingsley will consult Kathy Otto for a report.

### Guidelines

Billingsley distributed draft revisions to the “additional guidelines” section of the current guidelines document. After review and discussion, the following motions were approved:

- Offer restricted sections at a time similar to the open sections.
- CD credit for study-abroad programs/course work: Allow credit for either CD1 or CD2 (3 hours is implied) if the student petition is approved; require a substantial essay

describing not only the program experience (experience alone does not qualify) but how it met the learning outcomes of the CD competency (documentation required).

- Strike the statement about provisions for course substitutions.
- CD course equivalency determinations: Replace the word “substitute” with “transfer course.”

\*Action: Billingsley will update the revisions as approved by the GECC.

\*Action: Steinberg suggested that the statement about potential CD credit for study-abroad programs/course work be added to the form that students complete for the International Center (to be explored).

### Pending Issues

In follow up to a concern raised last semester, Busch distributed a document which explains his ongoing concerns and offers alternative wording for the CD requirement (replace “understanding” with “exposure to” and require CD1 courses in two different departments if a student opts out of a CD2 course). This agenda item will be discussed at the November 21 meeting. He further questioned whether some of the courses approved for CD (such as ARTH 335) are actually fulfilling the outcomes.

### Upcoming Meetings

The GECC is scheduled to meet at 3:00 on November 21 and December 19, 2008.

Prepared by Kathy Carden