

Council on General Education Minutes
February 18, 2025
10:00-11:00 a.m., STV 140

Presiding: Gregory Ferrence

Present: Brian Aitken, Gregory Braswell, Linda Clemmons, Gregory Ferrence, Amy Hurd, Katie Krcmarik, Julie Murphy, Joshua Newport, Brian Rejack, and Rocio Rivadeneyra

Guests: Dr. Lisa Tranel, Associate Professor, Provost Fellow

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

Action Items:

1. Approval of February 4, 2025 Minutes

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

2. General Education Revision Implementation Plan

Hurd informed Council members the plan is currently with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate. The Committee has scheduled a two-hour meeting tomorrow to discuss. As part of the review/discussion process, the Committee Chair, Dr. Dimitrios Nikolaou has requested an implementation plan. Provost Fellows, Drs. Lisa Tranel and Jennifer Howell, are working on creating an implementation plan. Hurd presented a draft of the plan to the Council for review (See Appendix A).

Hurd explained that currently there are approximately 250 courses that would need reviewed. To try to expedite the review process, it was suggested having an automatic approval process for those courses that would be considered “slam dunks” based upon their learning objectives. To be considered a “slam dunk” the course’s content would need to maintain 75% of the same content which is the percentage currently being used to determine AMALI and IDEAS courses. In addition, courses would have to have an average DFW rate of under 30% and could have no course pre-requisites.

The second suggestion would be to ask the Academic Senate to create an ad hoc committee falling under the authority of the Council to assist when/if the review load becomes too great for the Council to manage. Hurd has met with Nikolaou and Academic Senate Chair Martha Horst, and both have also asked for a proposed timeline as part of the implementation plan. Hurd included the timeline as part of the plan with fall 2028 as the target date of when the new General Education program would begin. In addition to the timeline, Hurd has asked University Assessment for information to include in the plan as well but had not received it yet.

Aitken asked why an implementation plan was being asked for at this time and wondered if it would impact the Academic Senate’s vote on the revision proposal. Hurd responded that so many people were asking for it that Nikolaou and Horst felt providing a plan draft would be beneficial for discussion and the vote. Rivadeneyra added the plan was not part of the actual proposal so it would not be part of the actual vote. Hurd agreed and added the Academic Senate would really be voting on policy changes to policy 2.1.9 and catalog copy.

Ferrence believed the current plan draft was reasonable and thought as long as it was clearly communicated that it was subject to change, had no reservations. He thought it also presented a good foundation for how to get people started and gave direction on how to move forward. Hurd mentioned she was nervous about having a timeline of fall 2028 as opposed to fall 2029 and added it would all depend on how quickly the departments/schools submitted proposals.

Rivadenebra wondered if the college curriculum committees could meet electronically and vote to speed up review time or if they fell under the Open Meetings Act. Aitken suggested to speed up the process if the Council could pre-identify courses for certain designation and give the departments/schools the ability to opt out. He did think there could be potential hangups with that approach and asked when Hurd thought the new curriculum system, Course Dog, would be up and running. Hurd responded she hoped it would be implemented by next fall.

Hurd noted that parts of the implementation plan may be revised, such as the DFW rate requirement. Rivadenebra asked if the Council would be responsible for approving the plan. Hurd believed it would be the Council but was not for certain. She will share updates with the Council as they become available.

3. Entrepreneurship Minor Revision

The revision was proposed by Dr. Hakan Ener, Associate Professor, Department of Management.

Ferrence noted the department was trying to make the minor more flexible for students. Currently the minor has three required courses. The proposal allows for alternative courses for each requirement and includes not as stringent pre-requisites. Ferrence felt the department made requirements much clearer by now proposing a list of potential elective courses rather than having the notation of having to have advisor approval for electives.

Rivadenebra asked which department owned the minor. Simmons confirmed the minor was an IDS minor, but it had routed incorrectly in the curriculum system which is why the Council was just seeing it for review. Ferrence noted the department did include letters of confirmation of the proposed changes from the other departments involved with the minor/minor courses.

Aitken took note of an editorial error in that BE 141 and FIL 141 are the same course and should be listed on the same line as opposed to separate line requirements. He also questioned if courses not used in the top section of course options could then be used as electives. He wondered if the department had intentionally not listed them as electives in both places and gave IDS 113 as an example. Ferrence suggested that the department listed the courses in that manner because their intent was to sunset the course(s). Aitken agreed that would make sense.

A motion was made by Rivadenebra to approve the minor revision pending the editorial change for the BE/FIL 141 requirement line. Seconded by Aitken.

All in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

The motion carried.

4. MUS 159 Survey of Rock and Popular Music (new course proposed for FA designation)

The course was proposed by Dr. Adriana Ransom, Chair, School of Music

Ferrence informed the Council the course was a pseudo new course as it had historically been offered as a variation of MUS 152 which already has the FA designation. The School of Music wishes to try and split out these variations into separate classes to make topics more transparent to students as they register.

Ferrence asked if the MUS 152 variations were decimalized sections before. Aitken responded they were not. Students would not know what topic they signed up for as they varied between the different sections/instructors each semester. Rivadeneyra thought the course looked good for the designation. Aitken noted a follow-up should be sent to IAI Program Director Malinda Aiello as if the plan is to eventually phase out MUS 152, it will have a significant impact on IAI. Hurd said she would follow-up with Aiello.

A motion was made by Krcmarik to approve MUS 159 for the FA designation. Seconded by Braswell.

All in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

The motion carried.

5. HIS 110 Race and African American Life (new course proposed for UST designation)

The course was proposed by Ron Gifford, Director of Academic Programs, Department of History

The Council had reviewed the proposal at previous meetings and had asked for additional information. Ferrence noted the department provided a sample outline and a detailed syllabus as requested. He also noted the proposal explicitly stated the course would not be proposed for the IDEAS designation. Rivadeneyra felt the course would be a good candidate for IDEAS and recommended the Council suggest it be proposed as one to the department.

A motion was made by Murphy to approve HIS 110 for the UST designation. Seconded by Rejack.

Rivadeneyra noted the department did not provide the supporting General Education rationale and thought the Council should request the documentation before proceeding. Ferrence agreed as the Council has requested the documentation for all other proposals.

A motion was made by Murphy to rescind the previous motion. Seconded by Aitken.

The proposal was tabled, and Hurd will ask the department to provide the General Education rationale documentation.

6. LGS 102 Introduction to Law and Justice (new course proposed for ICL designation)

The course was proposed by Brittney Vietti, Academic Advisor, Department of Politics and Government.

Ferrence noted it was a new course and that the department had submitted all required documentation. Rivadeneyra thought the course would fit well within the ICL designation.

A motion was made by Murphy to approve LGS 102 for the ICL designation. Seconded by Rejack.
All in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

The motion carried.

Meeting adjourned: 10:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Soemer Simmons

Implementation Plan

The implementation plan listed below is a high-level overview of the work to be completed. Throughout the document there are references to previous general education curricula. For example, general education 12 is the curriculum with inner, middle, and outer core requirements. Gen Ed 14 is the current program where the 3 core requirements were removed. For clarity purposes only, the proposed structure is labeled gen ed 25.

This plan suggests a Fall 2028 start. This start date should be reviewed after the first year to ensure the university is on track with program proposals and will be able to populate enough general education seats for the incoming Fall 2028 class.

Review Committees:

The most labor-intensive part of changing any general education curriculum is course review. The Council for General Education has this charge. However, to manage the workload, a course can be reviewed through one of two options.

Option 1: Expedited Approval

- If an already existing general education course will be proposed for the similar category with only minor changes to content and new learning outcomes, the course will go through the expedited approval process.
- Criteria for automatic approval could include:
 - Course is proposed for the same general education category such as:
 - Natural sciences = scientific literacy
 - Fine arts = Creative arts
 - Science, math, technology = Science, math, engineering, math
 - Mathematics = Quantitative literacy
 - Humanities = Exploring the Human Condition
 - Social and behavior sciences = Individuals and society
 - Average DFW rate under 30%
 - Courses maintaining the same number of credit hours
 - There are no pre-requisites on the course.
- Courses maintaining approximately 75% of the same content. For quality control purposes, each course would be submitted to the CGE via Course Dog and reviewed by 2-3 CGE members. If there is no consensus on course approval, a full CGE review will result.
- Rationale behind this option is to expedite the implementation of the gen ed program by minimizing the faculty burden of reviewing each course individually. This would allow the university to quickly populate the gen ed curriculum with courses that clearly fit the program's framework.

Option 2: Ad Hoc General Education 25 Curriculum Committee

- This option would involve the formation of an ad hoc sub-committee of the CGE to review courses ineligible for the expedited review. This sub-committee structure is similar to AMALI and IDEAS panels of experts.
- The CGE and the ad hoc committee would review courses based on categories (see example below).
- Sample category distribution:

CGE	Ad Hoc Committee
Experiential & Civic Engagement	Creative arts
Scientific literacy	Exploring the human condition
STEM	Individuals and society
Quantitative literacy	Information fluency through writing
	Applied writing inquiry

- The CGE's primary responsibilities would be to:
 - Establish clear guidelines and criteria for course approval for both committees
 - Review course proposals submitted for inclusion in the gen ed curriculum
 - Ensure the proposed courses align with the gen ed 25 SLOs, and credit hour requirements
 - Provide feedback and recommendations to course proposers
- It is recommended that CAS and WKCFE establish an ad hoc committee to review proposals due to the large volume those colleges will have.

Timeline for implementation:

- Summer 2025
 - Meet with advisors to discuss the new structure and implementation planning
 - Meet with chairs/directors to discuss the new structure and implementation planning
 - Begin outlining how the certificates will work.
- Fall 2025
 - Finalize the implementation plan
 - Present the new structure and implementation plan at the Gen ed Summit
 - Complete Campus Solutions configuration including such things as developing codes, building the structure, adjusting CourseFinder, etc.
 - Develop guidelines for experiential learning & civic engagement (ELCE) courses
 - Determine how we will articulate ELCE courses that are transferred in
 - Establish an advising subcommittee tasked with addressing issues pertinent to the advising community
 - Meet with CIPD about their role and planned professional development for Gen Ed 25.
 - Communicate the general education changes to the community colleges
- Spring 2026
 - Course Dog is fully implemented, and Gen ed 25 proposals may be accepted
 - Begin reviewing all IDS courses

- Establish a 5-year review plan that coincides with IAI course review
- Present Gen Ed 25 at the Spring Teaching Institute
- Begin reviewing community college articulation agreements.
- Stop reviewing proposals for gen ed 14.
- Summer 2026
 - CIPD begins offering experiential learning and civic engagement course development workshops
- Fall 2026
 - Continue to review courses and revised plans of study
 - Department/School plans of study will require editorial changes.
- Spring 2027
 - Continue to review courses and revised plans of study
- Fall 2027
 - Review the AP credit list to ensure the articulation is still correct.
 - Continue to review courses and revised plans of study
- Spring 2028
 - Update catalog copy to make the switch to Gen Ed 25.
 - Update website to go live with the new catalog
- Summer 2028
 - Gen ed goes live with the release of the 2028-2029 catalog
 - Provide training workshops for advisors and Preview staff
- Fall 2028
 - New general education curriculum begins

IAI process:

- New courses: Any new general education courses developed that align to a particular IAI GECC code can be submitted as a new course for review by the appropriate panel.
- Current IAI GECC approved courses (minimal changes): If there are limited changes such as only a change in learning outcomes, no further IAI panel review is needed until the course comes up for review.
- Current IAI GECC approved courses (significant changes): These courses will need to be reviewed by the appropriate GECC panel again to ensure they still align with that IAI code and the panel's course approval criteria. This can be handled a couple of different ways:
 - It can be submitted as a new course, and the old course ended in ISU's IAI course database; or
 - Ask the ISU IAI Course Submitter, Malinda Aiello, to call the course(s) for ongoing review (OR) and submit the revised course for review by the panel under the OR process.

Regardless of if courses are submitted as new or ongoing review, faculty shall first review a panel's descriptor(s) and course approval criteria then make changes and/or additions to the course syllabus to ensure all required information for panel review has been included and all required topics required for panel approval are being adequately covered within the course. This information can be accessed on the iTransfer website at [General Education Core Curriculum Panels | iTransfer](#).

Simultaneous General Education Curricula

The general education curriculum is catalog year based, so students entering in Fall of 2028 will start with Gen Ed 25 requirements. Those students who were in catalog years prior to 2028 will follow gen ed 14 requirements. Courses will maintain their gen ed 14 attributes (code) so students who have yet to graduate will know which courses fulfill gen ed 14 requirements. Courses that are currently approved for gen ed 14 and are also approved for gen ed 25 will have both attributes. If a course is only approved for gen ed 25, it will only have that attribute. If a student prefers to move to a new catalog year to complete gen ed 25, they can do so as long as they consult their advisor on the impacts of the move as students must follow the same catalog year for general education, graduation, and major, sequence, and minor requirements.

In Campus Solutions the gen ed 14 requirements will remain active in degree audit for students to continue to complete. At the same time, we will build the gen ed 25 requirements effective with the 2028 catalog year. This is the same process that is followed when changes are made to majors and students are in different catalog years. Advisors are knowledgeable in guiding students who have different general education requirements such as gen ed 14, IAI, and gen ed 12.

Assessment:

There is an existing gen ed 14 assessment plan that is category based. This plan will be adapted to the new categories in gen ed 25. The only change will be that assessment is no longer optional. To fully assess if the curriculum is meeting the learning outcomes is to have quality data in all course categories.

Potential Changes/Clarifications from Former General Education

Here are changes or clarifications from gen ed 14 to gen ed 25. See page 20-21 of the proposal.

- *Establish a syllabi repository for advisors and students:* This will not be possible without investment in software to manage the syllabi.
- *5-year review of courses:* General education courses will be reviewed on a 5-year rotation to ensure the category description is correct and student learning outcomes are being met. The review will coincide with the IAI review to reduce the faculty workload.
- *Eliminate pre-requisites:* Unless there is an absolute content specific need for a pre-requisite, they should be removed. IAI will not approve courses with pre-requisites other than ENG 101. Pre-requisites will be reviewed by the Council for General Education.
- *Elimination of major blocked general education courses:* If a course is major blocked, then it is considered a major course and not a general education course. However, up to 50 percent of the seats offered can be reserved for majors.
- *One category limitation:* Departments must select one category in which a course may count. This allows the course to adhere to the intent of the category more closely and reduces confusion for students.
- *Category exemptions:* Because of the reduction of hours in the overall general education curriculum, there are no category exemptions or LAN 115 substitutions for Quantitative Literacy. All students will complete a course in each category regardless of major.