

**Council on General Education Minutes**  
**November 19, 2019**  
**10-11:00 a.m., Stevenson Hall 140**

**Presiding:** Rebekka Darner

**Present:** Brian Aitken, Rebekka Darner, Katie Fisher, Rachel Gramer, Amy Hurd, Amanda Klingler, Lance Lippert, Sally Parry, Rocio Rivadeneyra, Liz Sattler, Georgia Tsouvala, and Chris Worland

**Guests:**

Malinda Aiello, Program Director, Illinois Articulation Initiative  
Derek Meyers, Assistant Director, University Assessment Services

Darner called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

**Action Items:**

**1. Approval of November 5, 2019 Minutes**

The question was called. Parry made a motion to accept the November 5, 2019 minutes. Tsouvala seconded. Ten in favor, none opposed, two abstained. The minutes were accepted.

**2. International Studies Minor (program revision)**

This item was tabled from the last meeting for further discussion.

For those members who were not present at the previous meeting, Hurd gave background information regarding the proposed revision. Dr. Shari Zeck oversaw the minor for the last several years. As geographic-specific minors became more prevalent, the International Studies minor saw a decline in students. Zeck consulted with the advisory council and voted to delete the minor. This decision was approved by both the Council and the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) but was overruled by the Academic Senate as it did not want to delete the minor.

A committee was formed by the Senate to discuss the minor and a survey was sent out to faculty who taught courses within the minor to determine if anyone would be interested in taking the minor over. Drs. David Cleeton and Michaelene Cox expressed interest in taking it over and met with Hurd to discuss deleting the current minor and creating a new one. Since that discussion, Cleeton no longer has interest and Cox was advised by the Senate to revise the minor as opposed to creating a new one.

Rivadeneyra asked if it was correct that at least one department did not support the revision request. Parry confirmed she had been contacted by several individuals within the impacted departments, including a department chairperson, who did not support the revision. Hurd added that if the minor had been new as opposed to being a revision of the existing minor, it would not have had this rejection. Parry responded it would still need to have approval though, as well as an approved Financial Implications form.

Darner wondered if part of the fundamental disagreement was the value of making the revised minor if it did not have support. Gramer asked how many students were currently in the minor. Parry responded there was a very, very small number of students in the minor and believed it was around

three students over the past five years. Hurd added that with the exception of three IDS minors, most have very low enrollment.

Aitken asked if study abroad was still a component of the revised minor and thought the minor may grow if it was no longer part of it. Parry responded the study abroad component had been removed which is one of the concerns of the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures (LAN). As part of the new minor, the language requirement becomes an elective. The department expressed concern that if one of the University's goals is to encourage more internationalization, shouldn't the language requirement be more central, especially for this minor.

Tsouvala responded she was not clear as to why certain classes that were in the current minor were kept in the revised version while others were removed and noted there did not seem to be consistency in those decisions. Parry added previously, as part of the procedures for requesting a similar curricular change such as this, a rationale had to be provided as to why a course was added and/or deleted. Aitken asked if an overall rationale was provided or if it had to be done course-by-course. Parry responded it was done for any course(s) that was added and/or deleted.

Darner questioned why the minor was needed, especially with the regional minors that exist. While she understood the argument regarding have broader topics, she questioned why the minor was not allowed to be disestablished. Worland added he had difficulty seeing how the IDS minor would be taken through a thematic approach as opposed to the students just taking the courses.

Council members reviewed proposed course changes and found additional discrepancies, as well as had suggestions for courses that may be more relevant to the purpose of the revision and make the minor more coherent.

The question was called. A motion was made by Parry to table the proposal and ask that a rationale be provided as to why each course was added and/or deleted. Woolard seconded. All in favor, none opposed. The motion passed.

Hurd will contact Cox and ask her to provide the requested information.

### **3. IDS 213 Comics, Graphic Novels and Society (new course proposed for H)**

Darner informed the Council the course had been proposed earlier in the semester for the SS designation. Hurd had contacted proposer Dr. Eric Wesselmann, Department of Psychology for additional information. Upon review of the Council's concerns and suggestions, Wesselmann submitted a new proposal requesting the H designation instead.

Lippert believed, given the changes to the proposed syllabi and course content, the request for the H designation was more suitable and thought compared to previous courses already approved, the course was now consistent with others in that category. Council members Darner, Parry, Rivadeneyra, and Worland agreed with Lippert on his assessment.

It was noted by Aitken that the new course syllabus incorrectly contained a reference to the course counting for the SS designation but otherwise agreed the course was suitable for the H designation.

The question was called. A motion was made by Gramer to approve the course for the H designation pending receipt of a corrected syllabus. Lippert seconded. All in favor, none opposed. The motion passed.

Hurd will notify Wesselmann of the Council's decision and request a corrected syllabus.

#### **4. HIS 105 World History (existing course proposed for H)**

Due to time constraints, this item was tabled to the next meeting.

#### **5. Review Gen Ed. Descriptions**

Due to time constraints, this item was tabled to the next meeting.

#### **Information/Discussion Items:**

#### **6. General Education Assessment – Derek Meyers**

Meyers provided the raw responses from last spring's student survey to Council members. Responses were received from 620 students. Meyers has been working this semester to add basic demographic information to responses. However, the responses given to the Council for review currently does not contain any of the additional coding. Meyers explained there is a lot of information to sift through and he is working to determine if there are any trends/patterns in the data, and if so, if any suggestions need to be forwarded on to others such as the General Education Task Force (GETF).

Hurd believed the information should be sent to the GETF, specifically, to the Assessment sub-committee for review. Meyers said he would be happy to share the information with the group. Parry was pleased with survey results and thought it would be a good idea to conduct the survey on a more regular basis. Meyers responded during this fall a different student survey was being conducted so he hoped this survey could be conducted again in the spring. If not spring 2020, then fall 2020 for sure. Parry commented she would be interested to see if the next survey would have similar responses.

Hurd thought survey responses were straight forward and overall, the remarks were better than she thought they would be. Meyers confirmed that overall, support for the General Education program was positive. Rivadeneyra asked if it would be possible to identify individual courses in order to provide faculty feedback. Darner agreed the information would be helpful to instructors who teach general education courses as a way to see possible course trends. Meyers thought going forward it would be possible to do this. However, for this survey, the approach tended to be overly cautious and the information was de-identified this time.

Aitken asked if Meyers had noticed any particular course trends in the data he had in terms of student satisfaction regarding the course and grades received. Meyers responded he had noticed one particular course but declined to name it or the instructor. Aitken and Parry suggested follow-up should be done with this course/department to address any possible issues.

Lippert asked Meyers what the next steps were in regards to survey data. Meyers responded he was open to any suggestions/direction from the Council. Lippert replied, if permissible, he and his students could work with the data to provide context and make it more descriptive.

Aitken made a motion to allow Lippert and his students to access and work with the data on behalf of the Council. Parry seconded. All in favor, none opposed. The motion passed.

Meyers will work with Lippert on the project.

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

Meeting adjourned: 10:57 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Soemer Simmons