

GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL  
Minutes of Meeting  
15 February 2005

**Council Members Present:** Bryon Clark (Chair), Betty Clay, Jim Cunningham, Jane Elder, Steven Emge, Dick Hackett, Gene Hetsel, Linda Kallam, Brad Ludrick, Shannon McCraw, Steve McKim, John Mischo, Sharon Morrison, Patty Pool, John Topuz, Chip Weiner (*ex-officio*), Suzanne Bornman (proxy for Cherry Wilmoth).

**Council Members Absent:** Gleny Beach, Charles Price, Josiah Schomer (student representative)

---

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 by the Chair, who began by reminding the council of the timeline related to its charge: The monitoring report is due 30 June, 2007, and the first drafts of the assessment plans from the departments are due to the council by 11 March, 2005. The drafts should include both proposed outcomes and the means of measurement of those outcomes. Dick Hackett inquired as to how much detail regarding the instruments needs to be included at this point. The Chair responded that at least some sample questions are needed. Linda Kallam asked if there would be a specific format for assessment plans from the various departments. The Chair responded that he will prepare a draft before the next council meeting. She also inquired about the protocol if more than one department is assessing the same outcome. The chair suggested that the members of those departments need to discuss the matter and come to a compromise agreement. Also included in the departmental reports should be any proposed changes in the outcomes themselves. The council will evaluate the departmental input and possibly send it back to the departments for fine-tuning. Subsequently, the entire report will then go to the Academic Council for approval. The first trial run of the approved plan will occur during the Fall, 2005, semester.

The Chair also reported the results of an effort to strengthen the general education program by offering scholarships to students who volunteered to take the mid-level assessment. So far 22 students have done so. Scholarships will be given to the top three performers.

The Chair then set forth the following immediate concerns for council consideration:

1. Should a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 2.0 be required in general education courses?
2. Should a minimum GPA be required in certain skill area courses such as computer science, math, English, etc.?
3. Should students be required to complete certain courses within the first certain number of hours of college study?
4. Should CIS/BIM officially be added to the general education curriculum? A committee is already in place (see 16 Nov. 04 minutes) to consider this as well as revisions to the proficiency exam. They will meet and report back to the full council at the next meeting.
5. Should there be some sort of exit exam for graduating seniors that assesses their perception of their general education experience? This could become a

part of students' graduation exit procedures and could possibly be included in a capstone course, as part of the Registrar's graduation check, or through financial aid, for example. The Chair suggested that the instrument be made up of some Likert Scale type questions as well as an open-ended question to allow students to express themselves either positively or negatively. A committee to look into this possibility was formed consisting of Shannon McCraw, Brad Ludrick, Linda Kallam, and Steve Emge. Dick Hackett suggested that the instrument should also be administered at the junior assessment level to measure perception of the gen ed course value while taking classes as well as after the fact.

Questions also arose regarding the computer proficiency exam which students may opt for in lieu of taking CIS/BIM. Where should it be given? When may students take it? Can students take it more than once? Should there be a waiting period in between attempts? Should there be a fee for repeat attempts? The CIS/BIM committee will address those issues as well.

Dick Hackett moved to require a minimum GPA of 2.0 on all general education courses both transferred and taken at SOSU that will count toward a degree. Linda Kallam seconded. Shannon McCraw questioned whether that would apply even to an associate's degree earned at another institution. The consensus was that it does, even if that might possibly negate such a degree. The council gave unanimous approval to the motion.

The next issue before the council was whether there are certain courses that students be required to take early in their studies. Patty Pool proposed that all gen ed requirements should be met within the first 60 hours. However, some majors (such as music) are designed in such a way that that might not be feasible.

The council then considered possible courses for early inclusion. Those suggested were Comp I & II, Math, Science, Speech/Communication, and Computer. The council was in general agreement to a stair step plan whereby certain courses would be required in the first 30 hours of study and additional ones in the first 45. The matter was tabled until the next meeting to allow representatives of the departments potentially affected to determine if they had adequate faculty staffing to be able to handle the increased enrollment.

The next meeting will be on Tuesday, 1 March 2005 and an additional meeting will be held the following Tuesday, 8 March 2005. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.