

**Council on General Education Minutes**  
**February 22, 2022**  
**10:00 a.m. - 11:00 a.m., STV 140**

**Presiding:** Amy Hurd

**Present:** Brian Aitken, Allison Antink Meyer, Mary Elaine Califf, Linda Clemmons, Gregory Ferrence, Paige Hofstetter, Amy Hurd, Tony Marinello, Bill McBride, Taeok Park, Yvette Pigman, Rocio Rivadeneyra, Indira Robinson, Chris Worland, and Haiyan Xie

**Guests:**  
Malinda Aiello, Program Director, Illinois Articulation Initiative

Hurd called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

**Discussion Items:**

**1. General Education revision update**

Hurd informed the Council behind the scenes work has continued with a focus on cleaning up definitions. Once the language is ready, Hurd will take the revision to the college curriculum committees for feedback. Hurd added that an individual had been hired to do some of this work to help move the project forward.

Aitken asked how Hurd expected those sessions to go. Hurd thought the response from small groups had been positive. She recently met with Dr. Rebekah Darner and CeMaST and received good feedback from the group. Overall, Hurd felt good about having the committees review but acknowledged the process was just going to take a while.

Califf asked if there had been any additional changes to the proposed revisions since the last time it was brought before the Council. Hurd responded there had been changes and that the reduce 30-hour proposed program would not be acceptable. However, while everyone has seemed to agree that the additional hours need to be put toward writing, funding those additional courses will be challenging. In addition, there has been no consensus as to which area/discipline any additional hours should be allowed.

Ferrence suggested Hurd meet with the Chairs/Directors Council as they will need lead time to prepare. Hurd had planned to go before the Deans last week, but the meeting was cancelled due to the inclement weather. She noted it has been difficult to get on the Chairs/Director Council's agenda, but she would be happy to meet with them if their schedule permitted. She will ask the associate deans if they would like to schedule one-on-one meetings with her.

**2. General Education Survey update**

Hurd informed the Council the survey was released to students yesterday. Once results are available, she will share with the Council.

**3. Curriculum Committee structure**

Hurd reminded the Council the University must have IDEAS in place in the next year and a half. An ad hoc committee is now reviewing proposals and proposals are slowly trickling in. Hurd anticipates the

committee will be inundated with requests in the fall. In addition, the Academic Senate has asked Hurd to review and plan for what curriculum committees will look like going forward.

Hurd explained that there are currently several curriculum committees on campus. The Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) is separate and reviews all things related to graduate curriculum. Members of the GCC are elected to specific committees and answer to the Graduate Council. The GCC is not an external Academic Senate committee as this Council and the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) are and there has been some discussion of making them one going forward.

UCC has tried several times to change its name to Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to more accurately reflect what it does. However, the request was rejected as the Rules Committee of the Academic Senate felt the Committee's charge included the review of campus-wide initiatives/requirements, as well as looking at current trends and reporting to departments which are broader than a focus on just undergraduate curriculum. The Academic Senate has now said the GCC will track and report on trends regarding graduate curriculum.

Hurd suggested the Council may want to update its charge to include the following functions:

1. Ensures that the spirit of the mission and goals of General Education is maintained by the program.
2. Continually monitors the program, ensuring that objectives of the program and the student outcomes are being met.
3. Makes recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding General Education program modifications.
4. Approves General Education course additions or deletions.
5. Consults with the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education regarding implementation of the general education program.
6. Reviews and approves or disapproves all new proposals and changes for IDS courses, majors and minors.
7. Makes recommendations on new and existing graduation requirements including but not limited to AMALI, IDEAS, and BS-SMT.
8. Oversees the work of the IDEAS and AMALI curriculum committees.
9. Serve as the college curriculum committee for IDS and Honors courses, majors, and minors.
10. Manage the general education assessment process.

Hurd asked Council members what their thoughts were regarding the need for a panel/committee being formed to review AMALI proposals and if a review process should be implemented for these courses. She also reminded the Council that it needed to figure out what the IDEAS committee should look like going forward in regarding the number of members, representation and term limits.

Califf asked how easy it would be to institute a five-year review policy for AMALI courses. Hurd said she would first need to consult with the AMALI faculty. Approval would then need to be obtained from this Council, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate, and then the Academic Senate. Hurd added that we would need a five-year review process for courses in the new General Education program going forward as well. Aitken agreed and pointed out it took almost 10 years to remove the General Education designation from a course. Having a review process would help in identifying and correcting issues faster.

Califf asked about the five-year review process all IAI-designated courses go through. Aiello explained that courses with an IAI designation undergo a review five years following their initial approval. To obtain the initial approval, course descriptions and criteria documents are used to evaluate if a course aligns with established learning objectives for the particular designation. Courses are then evaluated every five years to determine if the alignment is still accurate. Aiello strongly recommended going forward, a standardized approval process be used to review courses.

Califf asked if IAI review panels tend to get overloaded with having to review requests every five years. Aiello said the review for each course is based on when it was approved/last reviewed. However, an effort is made to try and balance out the work for each panel every year. Hurd thought it may be good if both General Education and IAI could get on the same review process timeline so courses that have both designations could be reviewed at the same time.

Ferrence asked for clarification regarding how/when a course loses its IAI designation. Aiello explained a course doesn't lose approval automatically after five years as long as the institution can show it has made a good faith effort to get it reviewed. If the institution flat out ignores or does not comply with the review process, the IAI designation will then be removed from the course. When a designation is removed, the institution is given a one-year notice as the change effects catalog copy and student planning/schedules.

Califf thought it would be beneficial if the new curriculum management system had a process that would assist in the curriculum review process. Worland asked if it would be possible to see the template(s) that are used to review IAI courses. Califf agreed that using the IAI templates may be a good starting place. Aiello said all IAI information was in the public domain, and she would be happy to walk the Council through some examples. Hurd would like to make things easier for the faculty. She will pull the AMALI faculty together to discuss their thoughts regarding having a review process for those courses.

Hurd asked Council members if they thought this body should be responsible for reviewing/approving degree requirements. Califf thought it made sense as the other possibility would be to have UCC be the reviewing body. Califf felt that group did not need additional work and felt the Council was a good place for these requirements to be reviewed. Ferrence was curious as to who the body was that would oversee the IDEAS committee. He asked if it would be an external committee of the Academic Senate or an external committee of the Council. He pointed out the Council does not have separate committees and was concerned how it would be able to populate the IDEAS committee with members.

Hurd responded she had had conversations with the Academic Senate chair and the Senate's thought was that AMALI and IDEAS committees would fall under the purview of this Council and not the Academic Senate. Ferrence asked if members of the Council would then serve on these committees as well and asked if Academic Senate committees have their own committees as well. Califf was concerned how the Council would be able to bring in members from the outside as members of these committees would need to have specialized knowledge that most committees do not have. She pointed out that Council members do not have to be General Education experts to serve, and she wanted to make sure the Council would be able to generate enough interest/expertise to establish long term recruitment.

Rivadeneyra noted that when the Council asked for volunteers for the initial IDEAS panel, the pool was limited. If the committees were part of the Academic Senate, she wondered if they would receive more attention and have a larger pool to draw from. Hurd believed there would eventually be a pool of IDEAS

faculty as there is now for AMALI. Califf asked how other curriculum committees recruit members. Rivadeneyra responded Honors courses are handled in several ways. The Honors Council is an external committee of the Academic Senate. Hurd noted reviewing Honors courses was listed as a possible update to this Council's charge and asked how these courses move in the curriculum workflow.

It was determined those courses proposed as IDS courses for Honors goes before the Council for review. Courses proposed as HON courses are routed elsewhere. Clemmons will find out how those courses are routed. Rivadeneyra added the Honors Council must submit yearly reports to the Academic Senate. She felt this transparency may not necessarily a bad thing for the AMALI and IDEAS committees.

Hurd believed one of the reasons the Academic Senate would prefer the committees fall under the Council as opposed to creating them as external committees is because the latter option would require the Academic Senate's Constitution to be changed which is a major undertaking. Worland agreed and thought it sounded as though the Senate was alright with the Council keeping both under our umbrella.

Ferrence asked if there was a precedent for the creation of a standing committee within another standing committee. He also thought if the IDEAS committee was a committee of the Council, one Council member should serve as an ex-officio member so there would be a natural conduit of information. Antink Meyer pointed out the Council for Teacher Education (CTE) is an external committee of the Academic Senate, and it has standing committees of its own. Members of these standing committees are not all members of CTE so this would be similar to what is being proposed for AMALI and/or IDEAS. She added CTE's bylaws include a description of its standing committees within them.

Hurd asked pending the confirmation of how Honors classes are routed, if Council members were alright with the proposed changes to the charge. She asked members to review the proposed changes and let her know of any additional concerns/suggestions so that they can be discussed at the next meeting. Hurd also provided members with a draft document outlining a potential structure for the IDEAS committee. She stressed the document was just a shell and was to be used as a starting point for discussion.

She asked the Council how the committee should be made up and asked if there should be six faculty representatives, one from each college. She added during the call for volunteers for the current panel, the majority came from the College of Education and several of the colleges did not have representation. She wondered if members should self-nominate as is the case for the Academic Senate. Califf thought having one representative from each college could be very limiting but wanted to ensure that everyone did not come from the same area. She suggested having a limit to the number of representatives from one college. Marinello preferred having a representative from each college. Ferrence noted it would be likely be difficult to get representation from each college but added that as this was a degree requirement for all colleges, they should have some representation.

Rivadeneyra thought it would be best to have a representative from each college. Califf pointed out the committee would answer to the Council, and we have representation from each college. So from that aspect, it may be acceptable for the IDEAS committee to have representatives from three-four colleges. Aitken asked if a representative from Milner Library should be included as well. He also asked if the committee should have a student representative(s), and if so, would they need to go through the Student Government Association (SGA) for approval. Hurd said she would find out.

Meeting ended: 10:56 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Soemer Simmons