

**Council on General Education Minutes**  
**September 25, 2018**  
**10-11:00 a.m., Stevenson Hall 140**

**Presiding:** Rocio Rivadeneyra

**Present:** Brian Aitken, Rebekka Darner, Min-Yu (Stella) Liao, William Nestel, Sally Parry, Rocio Rivadeneyra, Benjamin Stiers, Gary Weilbacher, and Chris Worland

**Guests:**

Christine Bruckner, Assistant Director, Center for Community Engagement and Service Learning

Rivadeneyra called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

**Action Items:**

**1. Approval of Minutes**

Due to lack of quorum, this item was tabled until the next meeting.

**2. Minor in Ethnic Studies Revision**

Revisions to the minor were proposed by Dr. Susan Kalter, Director of Ethnic Studies.

Parry questioned if approvals had been received from all departments who either had courses deleted or added. Rivadeneyra believed responses were not included from the School of Teaching and Learning and Psychology. She questioned if approvals were needed from those departments whose courses were deleted from the minor as they were no longer in the Catalog. Parry informed Council members an unrelated complaint had been recently made by an unnamed department to the College of Arts and Sciences' College Curriculum Committee. The complaint was in regards to the department not having the opportunity to authorize changes that involved their courses. Given the recent concerns, Parry thought it best the Council have all authorizations before proceeding.

Rivadeneyra pointed out there seemed to be consistency issues between courses that were listed in sections 2 and 3 of the course proposal. Rivadeneyra also questioned the request to include future decimalized instances of ENG/LAN 206, as currently, those instances do not exist. Parry responded that if the courses do not exist yet, they cannot be added at this time. Parry was not aware if the decimalized courses had been proposed yet but added once approved, the Council could then consider them for the minor.

Rivadeneyra will contact Kalter regarding the missing course approvals, course proposal discrepancies and the ENG/LAN 206 decimalized instances.

Due to lack of quorum, the question could not be called. The item was tabled until the next meeting.

**3. ANT 105, People and Food (proposed for SMT)**

This course was proposed by Dr. Kathryn Sampeck, Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

Parry informed Council members the course was part of the proposed Food Studies minor. Parry felt the course was a good course and was well thought of by the College of Arts and Sciences' College

Curriculum Committee. That Committee had two questions regarding the course but ended up forwarding the course to the Council as they felt it was not its place to discuss them. Parry confirmed the Committee felt either question was not a deal breaker for the course. First, the Committee questioned if the SMT designation was appropriate for the course. Secondly, if the course was approved for the SMT designation, it was noted that with the fair amount of overlap the course has with AGR 201, should that course also have the SMT designation. Currently, AGR 201 has the Social Science (SS) designation.

Aitken questioned if having the different designations for similar courses was common to which Parry replied it was. Parry questioned if the Department of Agriculture was aware and had approved of the course. Rivadeneyra confirmed Chair Robert Rhykerd had approved the proposal.

Darner felt the course focused quite a bit on Biology and overall technology and how technology changes over time. Rivadeneyra mentioned when she first saw the proposal she was not expecting the course to be a good fit for the SMT designation. However, upon reviewing it more closely, felt the course was a good fit for the category.

Parry agreed the course seemed to be a Bio Anthropology course. She asked members that since AGR 201 had a SS designation and both courses were similar, should the designation be changed then to the Agriculture course to SMT as well. Rivadeneyra said she would be willing to consider it if Agriculture would like to pursue the argument for the change.

Darner pointed out the course covers science techniques and terminology that is currently taught in introductory Biology courses and wondered if it was presumed students had previous experience prior to taking the course. Parry responded when General Education was last revised, it was presumed students would take the SMT course after completing the other science requirements. Aitken confirmed that in general, this was the assumption. However, over time, over one-third of these courses have removed prerequisites as a course survival issue.

Darner questioned if having completed a prerequisite course(s) was still a policy for all SMT courses as she noted it was a requirement on the form when submitting a course proposal. Aitken believed the policy was potentially still active but did not necessarily believe all SMT courses currently being offered enforced a prerequisite.

When considering the proposal, Darner noted she had assumed students would have to have taken BSC 101 as a prerequisite and wondered how ANT 105 instructors would teach the course to students not having a prerequisite course. Parry believed this was a good question as she assumed freshmen could take the course without having a prerequisite which could place them at a disadvantage when discussing course content. Darner thought it would depend on how the course was taught but she would be more comfortable with ANT 105 requiring a prerequisite course.

Aitken wondered who had the authority to make the decision regarding mandated prerequisites for SMT courses. Based on the course number, Parry assumed the department wanted freshmen to take the course. She suggested the Council may want to send the proposal back to the department with questions regarding how rigorous the course was expected to be in terms of biology content and if they felt the a lack of prerequisite would be doing a disservice to students. She also suggested the Council invite Dr. Gina Hunter to speak with the Council regarding the course.

Rivadenebra asked if BSC 101 had a General Education designation and Parry confirmed it had the Natural Sciences (NS) designation. Rivadenebra pointed out it would be a disservice to students interested in taking the course to add an additional requirement. Aitken felt that it having BSC 101 as a prerequisite would not be a disservice as at least one-third of incoming freshmen takes the course at some point. Those students who opt to take Chemistry or Geology courses to meet the NS requirement would be those who would then need to take an additional course in order to take ANT 105. Darner added the vast majority of students who take BSC 101 are freshmen but there tends to be approximately 50 sophomores/juniors/seniors who take the course each semester as well.

Darner wondered what the expected capacity of the Food Studies minor was but believed most students pursuing the minor would most likely take BSC 101 regardless. Parry responded that the most popular IDS minors tended to have anywhere from 20-50 students. However, most of the minors averaged around 10 students.

Rivadenebra noted the larger question was that if there was a policy regarding prerequisites and SMT courses, should it be enforced. Parry believed it should be enforced. Liao wondered if the class was intentionally tailored to a specific field or group. If not, she was concerned adding the prerequisite would automatically screen out students. Rivadenebra believed the intention was to open the course to all students as no prerequisites were submitted. Darner responded that College of Business (COB) majors would still need to take a NS course so the addition of BSC 101 as a prerequisite, should not adversely affect those students. Parry added that most SMT courses require a prerequisite and noted COB majors are more likely to take MAT 145 or MAT 146 to meet the requirement.

Darner noted it was possible that those students who took CHE 102 as the NS requirement would have sufficient knowledge to take ANT 105. However, she was not familiar enough with the course to know if topics that were covered were similar enough to be effective. Worland thought it was possible CHE 102 could also count as a prerequisite as the basic principles taught regarding the scientific method would be similar. Darner asked if ANT 105 could have a co-requisite. Parry was not sure if other courses in General Education had co-requisites but noted it was something that occurs with courses outside General Education.

Due to lack of quorum, the question could not be called. The item was tabled until the next meeting.

#### **4. Civically Engaged Graduate Rubric-Christine Bruckner**

Christine Bruckner, Assistant Director for the Center for Community Engagement and Service Learning (Center) distributed handouts to the Council regarding the Civically Engaged Graduate Rubric and Learning Goals.

The learning goals were established when the Center was created as not much information was available in terms of assessment. One of the main charges given to Bruckner in December 2016 was to help form assessable goals to measure student's civic engagement. Bruckner began researching the strategic plans of the University as well as those for colleges and departments. She also reviewed the learning objectives for individual programs and for General Education and made note of where civic engagement tenants already existed.

Bruckner then reviewed over 12 other universities with similar learning outcomes as Illinois State and conducted a literature review. The literature review outlined between 20-40 learning objectives

students/adults need to be fully civically engaged. Bruckner noted many of these objectives build upon each other. Bruckner wanted to make assessment more manageable, tangible and flexible with the ability to be applied to different types of engagement such as political, social, etc.

The first draft of the learning goals was reviewed by a combined group consisting of Jonathan Rosenthal, Erin Thomas, Ryan Smith and Derek Meyers. The group worked for six months to refine the goals and perfect the rubric. Both documents were launched this past January to campus. Bruckner added both documents were presented to faculty by CTLT as part of a soft launch and the group received positive feedback.

Bruckner noted that it is hard to assess engagement as it can be considered “fluffy.” The assessment process is a learning process and focuses more on self-reflection which is not necessarily an observable outcome. It is difficult to assess an experience’s meaningfulness as it may be something that cannot necessarily be seen. Bruckner informed the Council that Student Affairs was currently working on a set of learning objectives for their programming and learning experiences and have incorporated these goals into their process. Bruckner added the Center is also using some of these goals in their programming as well.

Bruckner went on to explain the two domains of Civic Competence and Civic Engagement. According to Bruckner, competence focuses on background knowledge and skills. This tends to be seen more often in General Education learning objectives. Civic Engagement consists of disposition and participation. Bruckner noted that the purpose was not to necessarily alter students’ dispositions, but rather, having them reflect on the experience(s). The goal is for the student to lead or coordinate engagement efforts, not just attend and event. Students are encouraged to take more leadership roles and engage within the community in a variety of ways.

The rubric provides a hierarchy of where students are based on building off of the goals. According to Bruckner, it is a lifelong process, not one that concludes once a student graduates. Rather, it is more about the student’s journey and understanding where they are in the engagement process.

Bruckner informed the Council the information provided was also available on Civic Engagement’s website. It has also been shared with the new IDS 128 course that started this fall. Bruckner hoped down the line when revisions begin on General Education, the information provided could be considered. She noted that the learning goals and objectives had been mapped back to the General Education goals and could be sent to the Council if anyone was interested in seeing the correlation. Rivadeneyra asked if the goals were mapped to specific General Education courses or to the general goals. Bruckner responded they were mapped to the general goals and not specific courses. However, she would be willing to look into specific course mapping and could send the information to the Council at a later date. Parry added the timing was ideal as General Education is in need of revision.

Bruckner agreed when reviewing General Education, the University would need to find ways to lay the groundwork for engagement as students moved through the curriculum. Learning service is already happening in higher level courses but it is unknown how much is being done within General Education. Bruckner knows the content exists but is not sure what it looks like.

Bruckner informed the Council the goals and rubric presented were very basic and can be tweaked or modified. Both documents are working, “living” documents and if anyone has any suggestions, to please let her know so she can update them. Parry asked if the institution was collecting engagement

information in a broader sense. Bruckner replied the University was collecting information for civic and community engagement efforts. She hoped it would evolve into collecting information regarding political and service engagement as time and staff constraints allowed. Parry commented the titles; *Civically Engaged Graduate Rubric* and *Civically Engaged Graduate Learning Goals* were misleading as they seemed to indicate the information was geared toward graduate students. Bruckner explained when research was first being started, the group was unsure of what it wanted the document to be called. IUPUI is known for having a state-of-the-art assessment center so the document titles were named after similar documents by that institution. Bruckner noted it was good to know about the confusion moving forward.

Aitken made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Parry seconded.

Meeting adjourned: 10:54 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Soemer Simmons