

Council on General Education Minutes

April 5, 2022

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

Presiding: Chris Worland

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

Guests:

Malinda Aiello, Program Director, Illinois Articulation Initiative

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

Action Items:

1. IDEAS Committee Bylaws

Hurd gave Council members a draft of potential bylaws for the IDEAS Committee so members would have something to react to and make decisions as to how to proceed. At the last meeting, the Council agreed there should be six faculty members on the IDEAS Committee but debated back and forth as to how many colleges should be represented and how members would be appointed to the Committee. Hurd was not sure if faculty appointments would need to go through the Faculty Caucus as this Committee is a sub-committee of the Council and not the Academic Senate. She will check with Academic Senate leadership.

Califf thought as the Committee falls under the Council's purview, the Council would most likely be allowed to appoint members. Worland preferred the vetting to be handled by the Council as it has a more in-depth knowledge of the functions and roles of the IDEAS Committee than the Faculty Caucus may have. Rivadeneyra asked what the process would be if the Faculty Caucus was responsible for the appointments. Ferrence noted in the past it has varied on a case-by-case basis. In some instances the Caucus may discuss as a group while in others, the item(s) are put on a consent agenda and must be circulated for two weeks. Rivadeneyra noted it was the double-edged sword of shared governance, while we want diversity, we also need to be efficient.

Ferrence suggested the Council could do the initial selection and vetting of Committee members and could then forward a memo to the Faculty Caucus asking for concurrence and/or feedback on the appointments. Worland asked for verification the proposed bylaws would need to be sent the Academic Senate Rules Committee for review and approval. Rivadeneyra confirmed they would need to approve them and that she agreed with Hurd's proposed changes.

Hurd noted one of the biggest questions moving forward is the proposal to have six faculty members with representation from at least three colleges. Pigman asked why only three colleges were required as opposed to requiring a member from each college. Hurd responded that she was unsure if the Council could get a representation from each college. Pigman agreed as she was not sure if Nursing could cover providing a representative as they could not adequately cover committee assignments now. She asked if there were any other reasons for requiring representation from at least three different colleges.

Hurd added the Council had been a little concerned this time when selecting members for the ad hoc committee as over 80% of those who volunteered were from the College of Education. She added that if representatives from each college were available, the Council could then have representation from each but would not be locked into having empty seats if a representative from each college was not available.

Pigman asked which colleges would offer IDEAS courses. Hurd anticipates all colleges with the exception of Nursing would most likely have IDEAS courses. Pigman agreed as most of their coursework has such a specific focus and program requirements did not lend themselves to the creation of new courses to fulfil the requirement.

Antink Meyer asked why a term of three years was proposed. Hurd responded she had just followed the term length of the Council. Ferrence thought there should be a stagger of two years. He added with the creation of the College of Engineering, it will be quite some time before faculty within that college will be able to serve as possible representatives as their numbers will initially be low and demands on their time high to serve on other campus committees. Califf added she would not want to require faculty from that college to serve on the Committee until they had been at the University for a few years.

Council members further discussed how to stagger term appointments. Aiello thought having six faculty representatives seemed low and noted IAI panels have nine representatives. Worland questioned if the student representative had to be an undergraduate student or if a graduate student could also serve. Antink Meyer asked the Council's student representatives for their thoughts. Hofstetter thought the student representative should be an undergraduate student as graduate students are in a different place. Robinson noted it was mentioned the graduate student currently serving on the ad hoc committee contributed greatly and that she would hate to limit her contribution by allowing only undergraduate students to serve.

Aitken pointed out the requirements for the IDEAS designation were already established and that the purpose of the Committee was just to review courses. The Committee could not make changes to the actual learning outcomes or to the requirement itself. Califf thought the point was well taken and noted any changes would have to be first approve by the Council and then the University Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate.

Hofstetter suggested having two student representatives on the Committee so the graduate student currently serving on the ad hoc committee could remain if she would like to do so. Ferrence further suggested having up to two student representatives, one of which has to be an undergraduate student. Rivadeneyra asked if faculty members had to be tenured/tenured-track (TT) or if non-tenure track (NTT) faculty could also serve. Hurd responded she felt it did not matter and that the Council's bylaws did not distinguish. Worland added NTT faculty have plenty to offer to these discussions. Rivadeneyra agreed and added many of the IDEAS courses would be taught by NTT faculty who have expertise in the area.

Hurd asked how the Council wished to handle ex officio representatives on the Committee and noted there are quite a few on the Council. Two ex officio members were proposed to serve on the IDEAS Committee. Antink Meyer noted this would give the Committee an even number of member and asked how a tie vote would be handled. Califf pointed out if there was that much disagreement regarding a proposal, it most likely needed additional discussion. Hurd added if there were a problem with a tie, the proposal would then come to this group for discussion.

Hurd also asked about implementing term limits on Committee members as she did not know if they were appropriate here as members would be selected based on their expertise. Ferrence noted if they were appointed, it may be easier to remove them from the Committee if need be. Hurd asked if the ex officio members should be voting members as they are on the Council. Califf thought they should be voting members, especially if an effort was made to have an Associate Dean representative who has IDEAS expertise. Ferrence suggested the IDEAS bylaws need to clearly state that while Committee members can review and make recommendations regarding IDEAS, they cannot make changes.

Hurd will revise the proposed bylaws and the Council will review again at the next meeting.

2. CGE Bylaws

This item was tabled due to time constraints.

Meeting adjourned: 10:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Soemer Simmons