

**General Education Curriculum Committee**  
**Meeting of October 15, 2010, 2:30 p.m.**

**Minutes**

*Attending (Voting):* Cox, Crespo, Haworth, Koerselman, Mansfield-Jones, Martin, Masolo, Singleton, Weinberg, Zimmerman *(Non-Voting):* Bays, Billingsley, Carden, Dietrich, Karega-Mason, Reed, Steinberg *(Guest):* McLeod

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of September 17, 2010 were approved.

**Membership Roster**

Corrections to the membership roster were noted, including the addition of Steinberg as a non-voting member.

**Faculty Senate Report**

Koerselman will circulate a DRAFT report for review and comments. After considering and incorporating suggested edits, the committee will vote on the final version through e-mail.

**Math Rubric**

Karega-Mason will circulate the updated math rubric, which will be posted to the general education web site.

**Assessment Report Scores – Phase I**

Karega-Mason gave an overview of the Phase I Assessment Report with the scores. This report includes data that was collected from all departments except for Natural Sciences (assessed in Spring 2010) and departments with curriculum designs that could not be assessed using the current assessment tools. The charts reflect the four stated measures for each score. Discussion included extensive questioning about the statistical methodology used in deriving the results, and the committee directed that further inquiries be pursued toward a report at the next meeting.

**\*ACTION:** Karega-Mason will investigate the history and methodology of this particular assessment and report back to the committee.

**Statewide SB Requirement RE: History**

McLeod provided a handout and presented a justification of how History 101 and 102 meet the statewide student learning outcomes (SLOs), although History is a separate 3-hour general education requirement at UofL. Billingsley explained that this affects students who take history at UofL and then transfer to another institution that might require history (not all do). The goal is that these courses be mapped to the SLOs to make the transfers seamless. Although the history department has their own set of learning outcomes, the proposal detailed how they are being taught to the satisfaction of the GECC that voted to accept the proposal.

### **Statewide Learning Outcomes**

Dietrich reported that A&S determined that the statewide SLOs match our general education outcomes, except for the history question that is now addressed. In summary, if a course meets UofL's outcomes, then it meets the wider statewide outcomes; in fact, general education outcomes at UofL are more specific and stringent than the statewide standard.

### **CD Petition Subcommittee**

Karega-Mason presented to the GECC the recommendations of the subcommittee to revise the process for responding to CD petitions in an accommodating manner. The subcommittee will 1) meet monthly to review petitions, 2) work with the advisors who recommend the petition process to students to clarify the intent and expectations, 3) postpone review if the essay does not meet the standards that are posted on the web site (350-500 words), 4) revise the layout of the CD petition site and include only category #4 from the rubric (re-labeling it "competencies" since the students may not understand the concept of the rubric).

Fannie Cox will serve as chair of the subcommittee. She reported that the tracking will be handled by e-mail, and if more information is required the petitioner will be given a 30-day turnaround time frame. During the most recent round of reviews, only one petition was of high quality and approved. Karega-Mason reminded the committee that there are no pre-approvals even if some students may anticipate approval. Some members think that the inclusion of "life experiences" may open up a floodgate; nevertheless, this allowance was added to the new process. Koerselman thanked the subcommittee for their work in refining this new process.

During the discussion, some good suggestions were made:

- provide guidelines for the initial reading of the proposals,
- update the information in the automatic response to the students to reflect deadlines,
- add a space on the form to identify the name of the advisor.

\*ACTION: Karega-Mason will work with Admissions to update the petition form and on-line information and also revise the wording of the automatic response.

### **Petition for NS Lab Credit or Waiver**

Billingsley explained that this one-hour credit waiver of a NS lab requirement came forward as a reasonable question; however, provisions have been made only for CD petitions. Not only would such a waiver open up a can of many other petitions but Dietrich reminded the committee that Phi Beta Kappa was just assured that the university does not grant credit for life experiences.

\*ACTION: Inform the petitioner that the committee declined to review this request because there is no provision for this type of allowance.

### **Future Meetings**

The next meeting of the GECC is set for November 12.

Prepared by Kathy Carden