

AC Minutes
August 29, 2025

Cody	Walters, <i>Chair</i>	Library
Kori	Bloomquist	College of Arts and Sciences
Kelly	Costner	College of Education, Sport, & Human Sciences
Dan	Drane	College of Education, Sport, & Human Sciences
Timea	Fernandez	College of Arts and Sciences
Jessie	Hamm	College of Arts and Sciences
Justin	Isenhour	College of Visual and Performing Arts
Kelly	Ozust	College of Visual and Performing Arts
Kevin	Parker	College of Business and Technology
Anna*	Romanova	College of Business and Technology
Mike	Sickels	College of Arts and Sciences
Ephraim	Sommers	College of Arts and Sciences
Joy*	Stapleton	College of Education, Sport, & Human Sciences
Paul	Wiegand	College of Business and Technology
Kristen*	Wonderlich	College of Visual and Performing Arts
Brent	Woodfill	College of Arts and Sciences
Victoria	Williams	Student
Gina	Jones	Rec and Reg

*Absent

Guests: Tim Drueke, Noreen Gaubatz, Sebastian Van Delden

I. **Approval of minutes** of the April 11th, 2025 meeting

Regarding discussion on course repeat policy:

...While we do not have the old 75 hour rule for CRTW completion, a reminder might be good. Mr. Drueke replied we could revive the old report and share with the student services offices to help keep students moving forward.* The council did believe that colleges could place a limit for courses within the major.

** Per the registrar, this report is still current and is sent to college student services at the end of each semester.*

No discussion. Minutes approved.

II. **Remarks from the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs**

(Sebastian van Delden)

Dr. van Delden said he appreciates everyone being on this committee, that this is an important committee. He asked if there were any questions regarding the presentation he

gave at Faculty Conference. He mentioned the listening session he had yesterday. It was recorded. He asked if we need a Gen Ed taskforce if we have a Gen Ed committee. There will be discussion about the best way to proceed. There were no questions.

- III. **Remarks from the President of the Student Government Association** – Victoria Williams
Ms. Williams introduced herself. She said if there is anything from a student perspective that she can help with to let her know. She will share what happens on this committee with students. Mr. Walters said feedback from students is helpful. We always want student participation. Mr. Drueke mentioned that if she cannot be there, to send a replacement so we always have that communication. Also, if there is something on the academic side that students are concerned about, to please bring it to this committee.

IV. **Reports from Standing Committees--none**

V. **Old Business**

A. *Course repeat policy*

Discussion last spring said that we could not prohibit students from repeating Gen Ed, but that different programs could have their own.

Dr. Weigand said the COBT did draft a policy which was approved by the college. Ms. Jones mentioned that this should go in the catalog.

VI. **New Business**

A. *CUC and Gen Ed chair appointments*

Dr. Costner expressed willingness to continue as Gen Ed Chair so Mr. Walters re-appointed him.

Mr. Walters then asked who would be interested in CUC Chair. Mr. Drueke indicated the support that came from Kara Traverse (secretary), Gina Jones, and himself. This can give someone great exposure to the UG curriculum. The first meeting is September 26, so there's a little bit of time to think about it. Dr. Weigand said that he would be willing.

B. *Gen Ed Assessment Committee (Tim Drueke and Noreen Gaubatz)*

1. Proposal for Modification to the General Education Assessment Committee Membership – **Appendix A**

Dr. Gaubatz went over the committee responsibilities and workload and explained the rationale for the membership to be increased.

There was some concern about workload of faculty.

Mr. Drueke said that given this had to go to Faculty Conference; it will be the December meeting before it's voted on.

Dr. Costner asked why this proposal was coming to this body since it's regarding membership of a faculty committee and that's done by the Rules committee.

Mr. Drueke said he wanted a broader committee to discuss this. He indicated that the Rules Committee will have to ultimately make the recommendation.

Dr. Costner asked if assessment results determine whether a course continues as Gen Ed, shouldn't there be a connection with the curriculum committees?

Dr. Gaubatz talked about assessment being an "add on." Those who are recertifying have an impact on assessment and should be working hand in hand.

Dr. Costner feels like we should have this in writing.

Dr. Costner said it is noticeable to him that changes that happened last spring (bylaws) and this proposal had bypassed the Gen Ed Curriculum and Gen Ed Assessment committees. We need to have a conversation about governance etiquette. Nothing prepared him for a formal proposal. Mr. Walters said this is discussion we should have.

Dr. Hamm asked about the number of faculty vs. the number of courses being offered which is not balanced. (279 Humanities and Arts courses vs. 30 Intensive Writing)

Mr. Drueke said he would be working on our auxiliary project with Zach Abernathy on the number of courses in the Gen Ed. A preliminary report found there are over 300 courses on the list, but only about 1/3 are being used by students over the last five years.

VII. **Announcements**

none

VIII. **Adjournment**

Adjourned at 3:17 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Gina Jones, Secretary

Appendix A

Modification to the General Education Assessment Committee Membership

Proposal submitted by:

Dr. Noreen Gaubatz (Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and SACSCOC Liaison)

Dr. KB Gwebu (Director of Assessment and General Education Assessment Committee Chair)

Proposal submitted to:

Academic Council

August 29, 2025

Introduction

Considering the responsibilities of the General Education Assessment Committee, the current committee structure is not optimally positioned to sustain this work. Without adjustments, committee members

(1) will experience an excessive workload and (2) will be required to facilitate faculty discussions outside their areas of expertise. Such circumstances create challenges for committee members and may limit the overall effectiveness of the General Education assessment process. To address these concerns, a restructuring of the General Education Assessment Committee membership is recommended. The proposed adjustments, outlined in the following sections, are intended to better align membership with expertise, distribute workload more equitably, and enhance the committee's overall capacity for productivity.

Committee Responsibilities

Per the General Education Assessment Committee description:

- Assessment of General Education shall occur every year on a rotating basis. The results of these assessments will be shared with the faculty teaching within each of the general education component areas.
- Committee members will be assigned specific General Education Components and are responsible for working with the relevant faculty to ensure (1) data gathering efforts are complete and submitted prior to deadlines, (2) data are discussed by faculty within each of the specific general education components, and (3) action plans for improvements based on these data are formulated and submitted prior to deadlines.

To allow the General Education Assessment Committee to work effectively with faculty from each of the General Education components, the committee membership should be representative of these components. This is currently not the case.

Committee Membership

Current General Education Assessment Committee Membership:

- Three members from the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences (appointed)
- One member from the faculty of the College of Business and Technology (appointed)
- One member from the faculty of the College of Education, Sport, and Human Sciences (appointed)
- One member from the faculty of the College of Visual and Performing Arts (appointed)
- Four Core faculty – Director of Composition, Director of HMXP, CRTW Coordinator, Director of First-Year Experience
- Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness (Division of Academic Affairs)
- Director of Assessment (Committee chair)

General Education Assessment

In addition to the General Education Core (ACAD 101, CRTW 201, HMXP 102, WRIT 101), the distribution requirements include the following components:

- Constitution Requirement
- Global Perspectives
- Historical Perspectives
- Humanities and Arts
- Intensive Writing
- Natural Sciences
- Oral Communication
- Physical Activity
- Quantitative Skills
- Social Science
- Technology

General Education Workload – Fall 2025

General Education Component	Number of Course Sections	Number of Faculty	Possible College Committee Member
Constitution Requirement	18	9	CAS
Global Perspectives	47	23	CAS or CESHS
Historical Perspectives	44	21	CAS
Humanities and Arts	279	68	CAS or CVPA
Intensive Writing	30	26	CAS
Natural Sciences	68	36	CAS
Oral Communication	51	40	CESHS
Physical Activity	60	23	CESHS
Quantitative Skills	37	15	CAS
Social Science	45	27	CAS
Technology	64	24	CAS or CBT
Core – ACAD 101	53	44	OSS
Core – CRTW 201	23	13	OSS
Core – HMXP 102	24	13	OSS
Core – WRIT 101	32	15	OSS
TOTAL	875	397	

During the 2025-26 academic year and for each subsequent year, committee members will communicate via email with General Education faculty several times each semester (i.e., instructional email, reminder email, missed deadline email, response emails to general education faculty inquiries). The number of emails that each committee member is responsible for could be greatly reduced with a larger committee. Currently, six committee members are addressing all eleven General Education components, excluding the General Education Core. Additionally, the impact of the committee member's email may be diminished if the faculty recipient does not recognize the committee member or does not acknowledge the email as coming from a peer (e.g., a committee member teaching Humanities & Arts General Education courses reaching out to a faculty member teaching in the Natural Sciences component).

During the 2026-27 academic year and for each subsequent year, committee members will meet with faculty teaching in each specific General Education component to share the data that have been submitted by faculty within the specific component, discuss the analysis, and facilitate a conversation resulting in an action plan to enhance student learning based on the data presented. A committee member with expertise in the content area (i.e., historical perspectives, quantitative skills, technology) would be ideally positioned to lead this discussion. Not only is their student data part of the aggregate

dataset, but they also have expertise in the area and are regarded as peers by fellow faculty members teaching in the same General Education component.

Recommendation

For the General Education Assessment Committee to fulfill its charge in an efficient and effective manner, it is recommended that the membership be expanded to include a representative from each of the General Education components, including the Core (i.e., from twelve to seventeen members). As assessment of student learning is germane to this work, every effort should be made to ensure that the faculty selected to serve on this committee have a working knowledge of assessment practices for student learning.