

**Kutztown University of Pennsylvania**  
**General Education Program & Assessment Committee**  
**11 a.m. Thursday, April 17, online via Zoom**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Megan O’Byrne (Chair), Alexander Hernandez (Vice-Chair), Meg Norris (Vice-Chair), Michele Baranczyk, Tony Bleach, Diana Ebersole, Erin Kraal, Lauren Levine, Derek Mace, Dannell MacIlwraith, Feisal Murshed, Krista Prock, Karen Rauch, John Stanley, and Tammy Wert

**Absent:** Deborah Hokien and Sandra Leonard

**Guests:** Kayline German, Brian Kronenthal, Michelle Savescu, Andrew Vogel

*M. O’Byrne called the meeting to order at 11:01 a.m.*

**Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes from the meeting held **Tuesday, March 25, 2025**, were presented for review. J. Stanley moved to approve the minutes, seconded by E. Kraal. **MOTION PASSED.**

**Proposals**

LAS 25057 – C2 – MATH 105: College Algebra

- a. M. O’Byrne motion to bring proposals to table. E. Kraal moved to approve motion. **MOTION PASSED.**
- b. E. Kraal motion to group MATH 105, 106, and 115 proposals. E. Kraal moved to approve motion, seconded by L. Levine. **MOTION PASSED**
- c. Mathematics representatives, M. Savescu and B. Kronenthal, were present.
- d. The mathematics department proposed to include MATH 105, MATH 106, and MATH 115 as general education courses in category C2 with SLO 3.
- e. GEPAC supported the addition of mathematic general education courses but had expressed concerns regarding the alignment of assignments with the assessment component, SLO 3.
- f. The committee suggested including more context and explanation in the assignments to demonstrate solid qualitative skills such as critical thinking and problem-solving rather than defining the SLO.
- g. E. Kraal inquired about the criteria for successful or partially successful assignments from a rubric standpoint.
- h. Similar issues concerning assessment alignments were also encountered in other fields and departments.
- i. Suggestions were made to consider alternative methods for future mathematic submissions that do not solely rely on MathLab as previous MathLab assignments were unusable or difficult to assess.

- j. B. Kronenthal acknowledged that while the curriculum of the courses might not align with the samples provided, the material itself did. He also noted that these courses would be required for certain programs.
- k. Recommendations were provided to the mathematics representatives to utilize GEPAC resources to develop or clarify the assessment components of the proposal including participation in Assessment/Rating Day for in-depth understanding of assessment.
- l. J. Stanley motion to table proposal until further information on assessment is developed, seconded by D. Ebersole. **MOTION PASSED.**

LAS 25058 – C2 – MATH 106: Trigonometry

*Reference to LAS 25057 – C2 – MATH 105: College Algebra proposal section*

- a. Motion to group proposal. **MOTION PASSED.**
- b. Motion to table proposal. **MOTION PASSED.**

LAS 25059 – C2 – MATH 115: Precalculus

*Reference to LAS 25057 – C2 – MATH 105: College Algebra proposal section*

- a. Motion to group proposal. **MOTION PASSED.**
- b. Motion to table proposal. **MOTION PASSED.**

LAS 25064 – FYSM – HONR 100: Honor Seminar One

- a. M. O’Byrne motion to group HONR 100, 110, and 200 proposals. **MOTION PASSED.**
- b. English representative, A.Vogel, was present.
- c. The objective of these courses is to establish an intentional honors curriculum with assessable learning outcomes that are flexible and beneficial for all students. The proposed courses are designed to work together to improve assessment, prepare honor students and address issues concerning blended honor and non-honor student courses.
- d. According to A. Vogel, HONR 100 is envisioned to be a guide through research for eventual independent research, with HONR 110 as an asynchronous online course and HONR 200 as a sequel.
- e. The proposal suggests the allocation of four general education credits instead of three for honor students. It was established that the General Education policy prohibits the granting of additional credits.
- f. The committee expressed concerns on the following matters:
  - i. Grading system
  - ii. Scheduling
  - iii. Credit allocation
  - iv. Impact of general education requirements
  - v. Faculty workload and resources
  - vi. Maintenance of in person experience as well as retention rates
  - vii. Changes to the existing FYSM curriculum and flexibility in category A4 requirements
  - viii. Proper training for faculty teaching the courses
  - ix. Potential increase in student workload

- g. Committee members suggested zero, one, or two credit courses, opposed to four credit courses.
- h. J. Stanley motion to table discussion until working meeting, seconded by E. Kraal.

**MOTION PASSED.**

LAS 25066 – FYSM – HONR 110: Honors Across Campus

*Reference to LAS 25064 – FYSM – HONR 100: Honor Seminar One proposal section*

- a. Motion to group proposal. **MOTION PASSED.**
- b. Motion to table proposal. **MOTION PASSED.**

LAS 25067 – A4 – HONR 200: Honors Seminar Two

*Reference to LAS 25064 – FYSM – HONR 100: Honor Seminar One proposal section*

- a. Motion to group proposal. **MOTION PASSED.**
- b. Motion to table proposal. **MOTION PASSED.**

### **New Business**

SLO 4 Rubric

 [SLO4\\_creativeworks\\_analyticrubric\\_proposedrevision\\_sp25.docx](#) ;  [Compiled feedback.xlsx](#)

- a. Item not discussed.

Assessment Reports

- a. Item not discussed.

### **Old Business**

Rating Day

- a. May Assessment Day is scheduled for Thursday, May 29, 2025.
- b. Item not discussed.

### **Next Meetings**

Working Meeting

- a. The next Working meeting is scheduled for 11 a.m. Tuesday, April 22, 2025, to discuss proposals and other subjects as necessary.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.