

Council on General Education Minutes

September 30, 2025

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

Presiding: Amy Hurd

Present: Malinda Aiello, Brian Aitken, Linda Clemmons, Amy Hurd, Katie Krcmarik, Debbie MacPhee, Julie Murphy, Brian Rejack, Rocio Rivadeneyra, Robbie Shorter, Jing Wang, and Haiyan Xie

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

Action Items:

1. Introductions

Introductions were made.

2. Overview of the Council

Hurd gave a brief overview of the Council and its responsibilities. She informed members there were seven seats still vacant on the Council. The Academic Senate is aware of the vacancies and is working to fill them.

3. Election of Chair

Hurd opened the floor for nominations.

Murphy nominated Ferrence to serve as chair. Seconded by Aitken.

As Ferrence was not in attendance, Clemmons asked if anyone knew if he would be interested in serving as chair. Hurd responded she believed he would be willing to serve again as chair, but she would contact him to verify.

All in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

The motion carried pending Ferrence's acceptance of the nomination.

Hurd continued to preside over the meeting in Ferrence's absence.

4. Approval of April 1, 2025 Minutes

Hurd asked if there were any corrections to the minutes as presented. There were no corrections. The minutes were approved as presented.

Discussion/Update Items:

5. Course Dog Implementation

Hurd asked if Council members had attended any of the Course Dog training sessions. Several had. Hurd anticipates the system will go live any day now. Course Dog's company had a system-wide blackout yesterday which has impacted our ability to go live. Last week, individuals who had in-flight proposals were brought in to enter and test the system. During this test, a major flaw regarding the ability to

revise proposals was found and has since been fixed. There are currently 47 in-flight proposals entered into Course Dog. Hurd informed Council members they would receive an email from Course Dog when a proposal was available in the system for their review and that proposals would no longer be included as part of the meeting packets members receive prior to meetings.

Hurd added that we are all learning as we go with the new system. A new requirement with this system is the creation of an anchor syllabus for each course. Departments have been asked to keep a copy of all their anchor syllabi. Hurd added we know the syllabi are changed by faculty but when a revision proposal is submitted, the anchor syllabi is what will be required. MacPhee noted that she had entered in anchor syllabi for several in-flight proposals and that the process was difficult as the system was not flexible in its formatting. Hurd will check to see if there are any modifications that can be made.

Hurd noted Council members will find the category a course is being proposed for in the Course Attributes section of the proposal submission. This field will notate if the course is being proposed for either the General Education 14 or General Education 28 program or both. Rivadeneyra asked if a course were proposed for both programs if the proposer would need to submit two learning objective alignments, one for each program, as the learning objectives are different. Hurd thought while two alignments would not be necessary, a justification should at least be provided for a General Education 14 proposal.

Aiello suggested a note may want to be included on the system that those courses proposed for IAI designations will need to submit additional information. She wondered if the note could be added into Course Dog. Hurd thought it could and asked Aiello to look at the system and provide suggestions to her. Rivadeneyra asked if there was a way to include additional learning objective alignment instructions in the course attribute section. Hurd did not think there was but thought it may be possible to add another section to the syllabus portion of the system. She will follow-up with the Registrar's Office to find out.

Hurd showed members how to look at the workflow status of proposals in the Toolbox section. She noted that unlike the previous system, we will not be able to fix things on the fly. If a proposal is rejected, it will kill the proposal entirely and the proposer will need to start the process over again. If a proposal is routed back for revision, it can be decided which level it should be returned to for review. Rivadeneyra asked if it were possible to shrink the screen view of the Toolbox section so proposals could be viewed more easily. Hurd will ask Ryan Gray in the Registrar's Office.

Another change going forward is that editorial changes will now be called/considered as minor changes. Courses will no longer be put on circulation. Hurd added this process was unique to Illinois State. Cross-listed courses are very problematic in Course Dog and will need to be managed on a case-by-case basis. If a course proposal is part of a larger major change, the course proposal(s) must be approved prior to submitting the major change proposal. The Financial Implications Form (FIF) process has been streamlined and is included in the submission process of Course Dog.

Hurd informed members that training videos were available on the Curriculum website and questions could be sent to Curriculum@ilstu.edu. She added it required a lot of time by Registrar staff on this project and they had done an amazing job on the Course Dog implementation.

6. General Education 28 Update

Hurd reminded the Council the General Education 28 revision was approved by the Academic Senate last spring. The implementation plan is currently on track and is available on the General Education website.

Hurd spoke to Civic Engagement and CIPD over the summer to work on classes for the Experiential Learning category. She also spoke to the colleges over the summer and thinks the Council will start seeing proposals in Course Dog once it goes live.

Rivadeneyra asked if departments should start submitting proposals this fall. Hurd thought they might as well as there are around 260 current general education courses that would need to be reviewed. She was not sure of what the percentage of expedited courses there would be. Rejack asked who in departments were responsible for figuring out the review process and the labor and time associated with having to review and submit so many proposals. Hurd suggested departments map out the courses they would like to have considered for General Education and then see of those, which can be expedited as it is a much shorter process. Rejack asked if proposals had to be submitted by department/school chairs or if anyone could submit proposals. Hurd confirmed anyone could submit a proposal but only chairs/directors could approve a proposal to move it to the next step of the workflow process.

Hurd added that we have until spring 2028 so the proposals could be spread out over the next two years. Aitken suggested this timeframe be moved back to fall 2027 as advisors will need time to prepare and learn the new program. Krcmarik asked if her department has courses they wanted considered for the current General Education 14 program how should they be submitted. Hurd asked if they were currently General Education courses which Krcmarik responded they were not. Hurd recommended the courses be submitted then for both General Education programs at the time of submission.

Rivadeneyra asked about DFW rates as part of the expedited process of the implementation plan as she thought it had been removed. Hurd responded it could be removed and that the group could discuss DFW rates as part of the course review process. Aiello asked if the course grade distributions were looked at by any review level of the proposal. Rivadeneyra responded the College of Arts and Sciences were having conversations with its departments regarding DFW rates. Rivadeneyra asked if there was an option in Course Dog to submit a course for the expedited process. Hurd confirmed there was a separate workflow approval process already built to manage the process.

7. Articulation Agreement Workshops

Hurd noted the University's new strategic plan *Excellence by Design: 2024-2030* calls for an increase in articulation agreements with community colleges. Earlier this fall, Hurd held two sessions to discuss the articulation agreement process, STAR legislation, and other legislation currently being discussed in Springfield. Over 80 people attended the sessions. Hurd believes similar sessions should be held every few years going forward.

Rivadeneyra made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Rejack.

Meeting adjourned: 10:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Soemer Simmons