

General Education Committee Minutes
March 25, 2026, 4:00 p.m.
COMBS 348 and [Zoom](#)

Present: Paul Fallon (chair), Suzie Kim (secretary), Leanna Giancarlo, Alan Griffith, Debra Schleef (Ex Officio), Brian Ogle (Ex Officio), Melissa Yakabowski (Ex Officio), Kimberly Young (Associate Provost for Career and Workforce)

1. The meeting was called to order at 4:05 pm.

2. AMW Proposed Updates and welcome to guest Kimberly Young

The committee welcomed Kimberly Young, who attended in place of Alex Dunn, currently on leave. Kimberly shared responses to the committee's prior feedback, including a side-by-side comparison of the current and proposed Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Responses from Alex were indicated in blue, and Kimberly addressed questions from the committee.

Paul thanked the team for the detailed responses. Debra recommended that the SLOs not be changed, noting that they were developed over a 10–12 year process and that consistency is necessary for meaningful data collection. She emphasized that adjustments can be made through revisions to assessment rubrics rather than altering the SLOs themselves. She also noted that significant changes to SLOs could disrupt longitudinal data and that SLOs are intended to remain broad.

Kimberly responded that the proposed revisions offer greater clarity and asked about the potential impact of changing the SLOs, particularly in relation to assessment and the goals of the QEP. Debra reiterated that assessment is primarily measured through rubrics and referenced data collected from 2019 to 2026. She suggested that some proposed elements, particularly in SLO 4, could instead be incorporated into the rubric.

Paul asked whether there are examples that clearly distinguish between SLOs and rubrics. Debra directed the committee to the IAE website and reviewed the "After Mary Washington" rubric with members. She proposed refining the rubrics rather than changing the SLOs.

Kimberly noted that recent assessment efforts have provided valuable insight into student learning and argued that these findings should be reflected in the SLOs to help students better articulate their academic experiences. Paul supported the idea of focus groups and asked whether rubric revisions could be pursued without changing the SLOs. Kimberly expressed concern that the specific impact of not revising the SLOs had not been clearly articulated.

Leanna thanked the team for their work and noted that changing SLOs would require all existing courses to be resubmitted, creating a significant administrative burden. Debra added that while many faculty are already incorporating reflective practices, such elements could be further emphasized within AMW through rubric adjustments.

Alan observed that the proposed SLOs may offer greater clarity, but maintaining the current SLOs would be more practical, especially during an ongoing assessment cycle. He raised concerns about changing the framework mid-evaluation period and its implications for data interpretation.

Kimberly clarified that the intention was not to change the overall system but to refine the articulation of learning outcomes. Debra suggested that some proposed changes could be incorporated by renaming or restructuring existing SLOs rather than replacing them entirely, and that certain elements may be better suited as subcomponents or rubric criteria.

Kimberly and Debra agreed to meet further to discuss these issues.

A formal motion was made to send the proposal back for further discussion. The motion carried.

3. Courses

There were no courses to be evaluated.

4. Requests for Re-evaluation

(Course titles reflect original course numbers from transferring institutions.)

4.1. MATH 151 Precalculus Mathematics: QR

The General Education Committee unanimously denied the QR request. The committee agreed that the response to question #1 does not fully address the intent of the first learning outcome, which emphasizes producing and interpreting quantitative information in multiple forms. Solving equations and viewing graphs do not demonstrate a clear understanding of how quantitative information is interpreted in two- or three-dimensional space. Also, the responses to questions #2 and #3 are also insufficient, as it is unclear what conclusions were drawn from the analysis. More specific examples of how mathematical methods were applied to contemporary problems would have strengthened the submission.

4.2. ENG 255 World Literature: DGP

The General Education Committee unanimously approved the request.

4.3. EDU 200 Introduction to Teaching as a Profession: BTC

The General Education Committee unanimously denied the BTC request. The committee determined that while BTC requirements align with elements in the syllabus, the rationale is insufficient. The student does not adequately address how the experience meets BTC criteria. The response to question #1 focuses on strengths but does not sufficiently address how weaknesses were identified and developed. Additionally, the description of the required 20 hours lacks detail regarding specific activities and outcomes. The committee recommends revision and resubmission with more detailed feedback.

4.4. BIO 141 Human Anatomy & Physiology: NSL

The General Education Committee unanimously denied the NSL request. As presented, the course does not appear to sufficiently address the scientific method, and its scope is more limited than that of typical NS courses at UMW. In addition, the laboratory component for BIO 141 is described in the syllabus as an “Open Lab,” and the brief description suggests that these labs are not structured to support student engagement with the scientific process, but instead focus on observation of models of human systems and review of course materials.

4.5. ENV 121 Environmental Science: NSL

The General Education Committee unanimously approved the request.

4.6. ENG 255 World Literature: DGP

The General Education Committee unanimously approved the request.

5. Old Business

The committee voted unanimously to have Paul post examples for DGP and NSL on the University General Education Committee website.

6. Other Business

None.

7. Next Meeting

The originally scheduled meeting on Wednesday, April 1, 2026, at 4 pm in Combs 348 was too soon. Paul will confirm whether new agenda items require review and will schedule a meeting in April to introduce newly elected committee members.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:21 pm.

[Minutes approved electronically by the Committee on March 30, 2026]