

**General Education Committee**  
**April 11, 2022**  
**Minutes**

Present: A.I. Ross, Teri Walker, Michael Braunstein, Tim Hargrave, Maura Valentino, John Choi, Elaine Glenn, Peter Gray, John Neurohr, Mike Gimlin, Brady Smith, Michael Goerger, Megan McConnell, and Scott Carlton.

Absent: None

Guest(s): None

Meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m.

A.I. moved to approve the April 4, 2022 meeting minutes. Maura seconded and motion passed.

Chair's report – Teri reported she is working Military Science on a GE course proposal for next year. Working to add the DHC information to the assessment plan. Teri now has the information needed for the "Need to know" resources page on the website. Also working on a "frequently asked questions" page. That should almost be finished and Teri meets with Trista tomorrow.

Teri asked if the assessment plan should be on the website. The committee felt that it should be.

Teri asked if the committee would like to see the General Education website before it goes live. Michael B indicated he would like notification that it has gone live so individuals can go look at it.

PHIL 111 – PHIL 111 was added during the 20-21 academic year. The course was supposed to only be added as a AW1 course, but was accidentally added to the student academic report (AR) as completely the K1: Academic Writing II knowledge area as well. There was only one section of this course that has been offered. Mike Gimlin provided information on how this error is effecting the students who were in this course and how it is being applied in their AR. First two students should have a notice sent to them indicating that this course was applied to two different areas and that PHIL 111 will be removed from AWII and only applied to AWI. Michael B suggested that this information also goes to their academic advisor. Megan suggested adding "If this causes you concern, please speak with your academic advisor." Mike G will send notices to the first two students. Michael B moved that the Office of the Registrar notify the first two students that PHIL 111 will be removed from K1,P1 Academic Writing II as well as informing their academic advisors in accordance with the language we have recommended. A.I. seconded and motion passed.

Row 3 (green) – This error would not affect the student, as they either failed the course, are not a matriculated student, or the student has other courses in AWII already.

Yellow – These are students who it appears took this course specifically to satisfy K1,P1 Academic Writing II. The committee discussed what needs to be done with these students. A.I. asked if we know if PHIL 111 would give the same skills necessary for Academic Writing II.

Michael G – AWI & II are different. Writing skills is a scholastic requirement of a degree. Have these students met the legal requirement. Maybe they need to submit a paper from another course for review.

Several things the committee discussed was wanting to maintain academic integrity in writing, looking at the financial impact, and time to graduation. Currently there is not quite enough information, especially looking at the learner outcomes.

A.I. recommended Dr. Dan Martin, the Writing Program Administrator in the English Department and GE Assessment Coordinator, to review writing samples supplied by the students that demonstrate reasonable fulfillment of AWII outcomes/skills. This would ensure that the review is done by a person with expertise, does not delay students' time or financial costs, etc.

Megan indicated that if they have time to fit it in, there is an opportunity cost to repeating a course they thought and were told they were done with. Most of our students are working while going to school.

Mike G asked the committee to have solutions in place by next Monday and definitely a decision by May 2 before the fall and summer schedules are live.

A.I. suggested reaching out to Dan Martin if want him to review or provide an exam for these students.

Michael G suggested that when looking at what the students has taken and the writing required in those courses.

Elaine indicated that if the university makes a mistake the university needs to take responsibility for that and it doesn't impact a student's progress. Error in good faith in regards to the student.

Michael B suggested that by looking at additional work, we are imposing additional requirements on these students for an error that the student didn't have control of.

Mike G. indicated the committee should look at a General Education Rule that requires a C- or higher in AW I. Currently it creates an odd situation where a D+ or D will satisfy the AW I requirement, but the student will be unable to progress to K1 (AW II) because of their grade. AWII courses require a C- or higher as a pre-requisite.

Committee procedure manual – Janet went through the potential changes. Maura moved to approve the recommended changes to the committee procedure manual. John N seconded and motion was approved.

The assessment plan information needs to go into policy. Will bring this to the next GEC meeting.

Teri went through the assessment information in Canvas and demonstrated what faculty would see. There was discussion around communication of the process to faculty. There needs to be some improvement in this area. It was suggested that next year the committee looks at ways to make the process a little less cumbersome for faculty. Elaine expressed concern that NTT faculty do not always attend department meetings, and in some cases are not providing them that opportunity, so information is not being passed down to them.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m.