

## General Education Committee Meeting Minutes 10/2/08

Members present: Kranidis, Rita; Latimer, Margaret; Dorworth, Vicky; Farrell, Michael; Fechter, Sharon; Ringeisen, Phil; Rothman, David; Smith, Sean; Schleicher, Anne

1. Guest Paul Lux, faculty member from the American English Language Program (AELP), requested that the General Education Committee consider making the following change to the language of the Application Review form:  
*Current:* 5. Explanation of assessment levels other than EN 101/101A and/or RD120  
*Change to:* 5. Explanation of assessment levels

After much discussion, the Committee voted to retain the current wording. Paul felt that the request for an explanation of assessment levels only if other than EN 101/RD 120 was inconsistent with the approved Guidelines for General Education which state:

*A general education course will have assessment levels of EN 101/EN 101A and/or RD 120 when learning outcomes indicate that these levels are necessary for students to succeed in the course. Assessment levels for each course will be determined by discipline faculty and the General Education Committee.*

The vote to retain the current wording was 6-4. Discussion points included:

- New course proposals prepared for the CCC do not require justification for assessment levels of EN 101/101A and/or RD 120. This information would not be available to faculty members who are filling out General Education Review Forms. We discussed possible providing sample responses; however, we agreed that the level of detail for responses could be confusing to those completing forms, for example, would readability levels for texts be expected?
  - During our discussion, it was agreed that this Committee has not seen any evidence that there is a Maryland mandate that all courses within General Education must have an EN 101/101A and/or RD 120 assessment level in order to be part of a general education program. Although the General Education Committee agreed that these assessment levels are one way to indicate that a course is "college level," we also acknowledged that each course will be considered individually as per the guideline in italics above.
  - We agreed that the assignment of all assessment levels is an important discussion for disciplines and for the CCC to consider when evaluating new course proposals. Following the General Education Committee meeting, the Collegewide Curriculum Committee met on 10/3/08 and discussed this issue as well. A suggestion by CCC member Aggie Harrell was entered into the CCC minutes – a subgroup of the CCC should investigate how to work with course proposers to evaluate and assign assessment levels for all courses as part of the course proposal development process.
2. A decision was made regarding the actual review process for courses. Only general education committee members present at the meeting during which courses are discussed may vote; there will be no absentee ballots.
  3. We discussed, line by line, a Review Form which the Committee will use when evaluating individual courses. This cover form will be submitted with Committee recommendations and comments for each course under review. It was agreed that the numbers on this form should align with numbering in the Review Application.

There was a detailed discussion regarding the "Documentation of Transferability" information. We debated about how to fairly represent the sense of the faculty vote in March 2008 that stated "course transferability into general education categories will be one, but not a deciding factor, in the review process." It was decided that asking for a particular number of equivalent courses would not fairly represent this area. Pending a General Education Committee vote on the final draft of the form, we stated that #9, Documentation of Transferability, will be reviewed with these notations:

*The course has direct or very similar transfer equivalencies* Yes/No

*The course aligns with general education categories at transfer institutions* Yes/No