Council on General Education Minutes
October 28, 2025
10:00-11:00 a.m., STV 140

Presiding: Gregory Ferrence

Present: Mouna Bounouader, Elaine Chatman-Borowiec, Linda Clemmons, Gregory Ferrence, Amy Hurd, Katie Krcmarik, Debbie MacPhee, Julie Murphy, Brian Rejack, Rocio Rivadeneyra, Robbie Shorter, Jing Wang, and Christian Wesselink

Ferrence called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Action Items:

1. Introductions
Introductions were made.

2. Approval of September 30, 2025 Minutes
Ferrence asked if there were any corrections to the minutes as presented. There were no corrections. The minutes were approved as presented.

3. IDS 125 Foundations of Citizenship: Introduction to Civic Responsibility (existing IDS course)
- **Proposed GE14 – ICL designation**
- **Proposed GE28 – ELCE designation**

The proposal was submitted by Dr. Katy Strzepek, Director, Center for Civic Engagement.

Ferrence told Council members the proposal was for an already existing IDS course that was seeking GE designations for both the current GE14 program and the upcoming GE28 program. In considering the proposal for the GE14 designation request first, Ferrence thought the course seemed to be a good fit for the ICL designation.

As this was the first proposal the Council had reviewed using Coursedog, Hurd walked members through the system and pointed out items Council members should look at when reviewing a course and/or proposal. Simmons informed the student members they should have access to the system following today's meeting.

Hurd noted in the previous curriculum system, the Council was able to view both the old and new course syllabi for each proposal. With Coursedog, members will now only be able to see the new syllabus. Rivadeneyra asked if that were something that could be changed. Hurd responded she would add it to the list that is being compiled of change requests that will be explored with Coursedog. Ferrence added letters of support and/or rationale for general education requests are no longer included and asked if there was a way to download a pdf of all attachments into a singular document. Rejack agreed it would be helpful if everything could be downloaded all together.

Ferrence noted the proposal did not seem to include anchor syllabi and asked how that process worked. Hurd explained there was a template provided, and submitters could cut and paste their information into the template. Rejack asked if proposers were required to use the provided template or if they could replicate it in Word and attach that instead. Hurd responded it could be replicated in Word but should

only contain the specific information requested. Rejack noted the current template is very clunky. Rivadeneyra agreed but noted the anchor syllabus is not student facing and from a reviewer perspective, it has made the reviewing of proposals much easier. MacPhee said she had used it to submit several proposals and noted that the template did not allow for any special formatting, tables, etc. Ferrence added the anchor syllabi template was not compatible for certain requirements and cited safety language requirements for labs as an example.

Hurd noted the anchor syllabi contains no dates and should demonstrate the official content of the course, not the specific requirements pertaining to each semester such as due dates, specific section-related language, etc. Rivadeneyra added she had already had conversations within her college that the anchor syllabi was not to impinge on academic freedom. Rather, it was a way to ensure collection of information regarding assignments, readings, etc. that would help determine the merit of a course's fit into a particular GE designation, something as Rivadeneyra pointed out, that has sometimes been difficult for the Council to do given the lack of information provided. Ferrence agreed the past process had not always been efficient in relation to finding information and having the anchor syllabi would most likely assist in the approval process. He suggested that faculty will just need reminded that the anchor syllabi is not necessarily the syllabi that would be presented to students.

Rejack pointed out in the past, only a sample syllabus was required and asked how anchor syllabi could be so broad as to encompass all situations. He noted that for LAN 125 Literary Narrative, the topics and reading lists can be vastly different and asked how that could be reflected by the new anchor syllabus requirement. He added that, especially for Humanities courses, a sample syllabus makes more sense as an illustration of one possible way to deliver the course rather than an anchor syllabus that indicates there is only one way to deliver the course.

Ferrence thought it was good to have the conversation of what is binding vs what is exemplar. He added learning objectives would be considered binding while course artifacts would be exemplar. Wesselink suggested having both an anchor and a sample syllabus to help illustrate what proposers have the liberty to expand on vs what the University requires.

The Council returned to discussing the IDS 125 proposal. Clemmons and Rivadeneyra thought the course met the requirements for both designations it was proposed. Hurd will provide Council members an outline of criteria that can be used to help review courses proposed for the GE28 ELCE designation by the next meeting. Ferrence thought that except for missing the anchor syllabi, the proposal looked to be in good shape.

Rivadeneyra made a motion to send the proposal back for revision for the inclusion of anchor syllabi. Clemmons seconded.

All in favor, none opposed, none abstained.

The motion carried.

Discussion/Update Items:

4. GE28 Implementation and Assessment

Ferrence reminded Council members that the implementation plan for the new GE28 program was posted on the General Education website. He noted that the Council will be extremely busy as over 200

courses currently count toward GE14 and will most likely be re-submitted for review for GE28. These proposals would need to be reviewed by the Council. Ferrence added as part of GE28, all courses would be on a 5-year rotation for review to ensure course content and learning objectives continue to meet designation requirements. This review will coincide with the IAI review process. Ferrence assumed this review was in deference to the HLC review findings regarding the University's overall assessment process. He asked if there were assessment plans in place.

Hurd responded the topic had been discussed in this week's Provost meeting and that the plans will be created with Dr. Ryan Smith, Director of University Assessment in conjunction with the AVP for Academic Planning, Dr. Cooper Cutting. Smith piloted a new process last spring with Fine Arts and will be invited to speak to those results when the Council meets in the spring.

Rejack made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Rivadeneyra.

Meeting adjourned: 10:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Soemer Simmons