

## Council on General Education Minutes

October 31, 2023

10:00-11:00 a.m., STV 140

**Presiding:** Gregory Ferrence

**Present:** Brian Aitken, Allison Antink Meyer, Gregory Braswell, Linda Clemmons, Gregory Ferrence, Amy Hurd, Katie Krcmarik, Josh Newport, Rocio Rivadeneyra, Jack White, and Chris Worland

Ferrence called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

### Action Items:

#### 1. Approval of October 17, 2023 Minutes

Ferrence asked if there were any corrections to the minutes as submitted. There were no corrections. The minutes were accepted as submitted.

#### 2. TCH 104 Introduction to Pre K-12 Education in the United States (existing course proposed for ICL designation)

The course was proposed by Dr. Allison Antink Meyer, Professor, School of Teaching and Learning.

Ferrence noted he did not see a designation listed on the proposal. Antink Meyer responded that this was the first proposal she had submitted as part of her new role, and she would be happy to make updates. Rivadeneyra noted the designation was listed as part of question five and was included in the General Education rationale that was submitted with the proposal.

Antink Meyer informed Council members that TCH 104 is an existing course that is not required in department programs. Students may transfer the course in and/or use it as an elective. The school has redeveloped the course overview to focus on what education in the United States means in society and social structure. The course explores education not from a teaching lens but more as the role of education in society and how it reflects society and in turn, reflects back on society. As the School does not currently offer a course in the General Education program, it was thought this would be a good course to submit.

Worland noted the line between the ICL and UST designation is always blurred, and he could see elements of both designations within the course. He asked what the faculty's thoughts were in proposing the course for the ICL designation. Antink Meyer responded she was not part of the initial course re-development, so she was unsure of how faculty came to the ICL decision. Newport suggested an integral difference between the UST and ICL designations were the time frame involved. UST courses traditionally tend to look more at the historical perspective, how one got to the current state. ICL courses tend to focus on more current timeframes and look at different processes. Antink Meyer noted while the course does include the history of education, it is not the bedrock of the course.

Council members reviewed the definitions and criteria for the ICL and UST designations. Several members believe the course had aspects of both designations and were undecided which designation fit best. Ferrence asked what the school was interested in and how many students take the course. If

students already take a different required course to fulfill the UST requirement, then it makes sense for the ICL designation request.

Antink Meyer noted the crux of the course discussion focused on EDI and the infrastructure of education in the United States. As the number of courses in the ICL designation is low, the school thought it would be beneficial to offer the course in that designation. In addition, the school thought it would be a way to reach additional students that may not have had teaching as an option on their radar. She added high school students are now expected to select study emphases with education being one and an education category within IAI is being developed. Educators Rising, an organization compiled of high school districts, has been created. One of its goals is to research avenues for students to receive credit when taking coursework in a specific pathway and to keep these pathways accessible to all students. Antink Meyer noted the curriculum for the proposed course aligns with the requirements set forth by the pathway.

Ferrence suggested the faculty do a formal objectives alignment for both the ICL and UST designations to determine which designation may be more appropriate. Antink Meyer asked the Council what rationale she should share with the faculty as to why the Council thought the course may better fit in the UST designation. Rivadeneyra suggested starting by determining what the point of the course is and then try to determine where it fits. Worland added that he believes there will be some balancing involved as the course description leans toward the UST designation while the course schedule has a more ICL designation slant. A suggestion was made to change language in the proposal and syllabus referring to “introduction to teaching” to “introduction to education.”

Hurd noted that the outcome of the Educators Rising pathway was to award credit for prior learning which was recently instituted at Illinois State. Faculty review the high school course(s) and determine the specific articulation. Most high school students would earn dual credit as the coursework would be taken at the community college level. This pathway will be a first for the University and there isn't a process in place yet as how to handle these requests going forward although a few departments, such as Nursing, does have a similar internal process in place.

Aitken wondered the last time the course was offered. Antink Meyer thought it was last offered in 2020. Antink Meyer then asked if the ICL designation would be going away with the proposed General Education revision. Hurd responded it would but that all the courses in the designation would find a home in one of the revised categories.

A motion was made by Aitken to table the TCH 104 for additional information/clarification from the school. Rivadeneyra seconded.

All in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

The motion passed.

### **3. PHI 202 Philosophy of Sex and Sexuality (existing course revision of HUM course)**

The course was proposed by Dr. Christopher Horvath, Chair, Department of Philosophy.

Ferrence noted there was no syllabus submitted with the proposal. The prerequisite for the course would change by removing the COM 110 requirement but adding an hours requirement of at least 45 hours earned to enroll. Ferrence thought the hours requirement seemed rather high and would prohibit

students from taking the course until their second year. Aitken responded that traditional students would not have enough earned hours to register for the course until the spring of their sophomore year. He added that by adding the block, departments use it as a form of course management which he was not in favor of. Ferrence noted as a 200-level course, it would be considered a junior/senior level course. Aitken confirmed it would count toward senior college hours.

Worland noted that based on the provided revised description, the course sounded more like a course in the SS designation as opposed to the HUM designation. Antink Meyer thought it would be helpful to have the course syllabus to determine if the requirements/content lent itself to upper-level students. Krcmarik wondered if the requirement was requested to represent a level of maturity given the course's subject matter. Hurd said she could speak to Horvath regarding the hours requirement but did not feel it was likely the department would remove the requirement.

A motion was made by Antink Meyer to table the proposal pending receipt of a syllabus and response to the hours requirement question. Worland seconded.

All in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

Ferrence made a motion to adjourn. Braswell seconded.

Meeting adjourned: 10:54 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Soemer Simmons