**Council on General Education Minutes**

**February 1, 2018 – 3:30 p.m. – Stipes 501**

**Spring 2018 CGE Membership**

Steve Bennett Geology (Math/Natural Sciences)

Krista Bowers Sharpe Library (At-Large)

Ute Chamberlin History (Humanities)

Jonathan Day Political Science (Social Sciences)

Gary Daytner Educational Studies (At-Large)

Keith Holz, Chair Art (Humanities/Fine Arts)

Bob Intrieri Psychology (Social Sciences)

Kishor Kapale Physics (Math/Natural Sciences)

Mike Lukkarinen RPTA (Human Well-Being)

Kathleen O’Donnell-Brown English (Basic Skills/Writing)

Betsy Perabo Liberal Arts & Sciences (Multicultural)

David Zanolla Communication (Basic Skills/Public Speaking)

Colton Markey Student Government Association

Kyle Mayborn College of Arts & Sciences (Ex-Officio, Dean’s Council Rep.)

Nancy Parsons Office of the Provost (Ex-Officio, Provost’s Rep.)

Michelle Yager Advising Center (Ex-Officio, COAA Rep.)

**GERC Members**

Marjorie Allison English (Past Chair, CGE)

Cheryl Bailey Communication (Fine Arts & Communication)

Kristine Kelly Psychology (CAGAS)

Martin Maskarinec Computer Sciences (Business & Technology)

Gordon Pettit Philosophy (Arts & Sciences)

Diane Sandage Sociology & Anthropology (Past Chair, CGE)

Emily Shupe DFMH (Education & Human Services)

**CGE Members Excused/Absent**: Intrieri, Lukkarinen

**GERC Members Excused/Absent:** Bailey, Kelly

**Ex-Officio Members Excused/Absent:** None

**Visitors:**  Lori Baker-Sperry (Liberal Arts & Sciences, Provost’s Office Intern)

#### Call to Order and Approval of Minutes and Agenda

Call to Order: Chairperson Holz called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes: Several changes and amendments were made to the minutes.

**Motion:** To approve the minutes as amended (Sandage/Pettit). Minutes approved 16 yes – 0 no – 0 abstentions.

Agenda:

**Motion:** To switch the order of the roll call to move it before the Additions to the Agenda (Holz/Shupe). Motion approved 16 yes – 0 no – 0 abstentions.

Roll Call: A verbal roll call was taken.

Announcements: Chairperson Holz told CGE/GERC that Bob Intrieri, Psychology, will replace Jongnam Choi, who is on sabbatical this semester. Dr. Intrieri was unable to attend today’s meeting.

Dr. Mayborn has learned from former CGE member Bill Thompson that in 2007 a document was created for circulation to newly hired faculty to introduce them to the University’s General Education requirements. It is not known if this document was distributed and, if so, when it was last sent out.

Chairperson Holz introduced Faculty Senate Recording Secretary Annette Hamm, who will be taking minutes for CGE/GERC this semester at the request of the Senate Executive Committee.

Chairperson Holz serves on the committee that has invited Fanbin Zeng, a Fulbright Scholar from China, to visit the WIU campus. Dr. Zeng will speak on “The Relationship between Social Media Use and Citizen Participation in the United States” on February 13 at 5:00 p.m. in the Union Sandburg Theatre. Chairperson Holz stated that 650 Fulbright Scholars travel to the U.S. yearly; universities can request up to four Fulbright Scholar guest lecturers per year. Preparations to request a visit must begin in the summer to make arrangements for the following year’s visit.

**New Business**

Reports:

Provost’s Office – The Provost’s office is working on 2016 Gen Ed assessment data, which is almost complete. Fall 2017 data is due next week, and the Provost’s office is waiting on two more departments to provide data from Spring and Summer 2017. Associate Provost Parsons hopes to have the reports to CGE by the end of this semester. Chairperson Holz asked why there is such a lag. Associate Provost Parsons responded that the Provost’s office has been waiting to hear what is going to happen with assessments and how things will be going forward.

College of Arts and Sciences – Dr. Mayborn had nothing to report.

University Advising – Advising completed its first semester of having an academic success coach. Of the students that were seen three or more times by Academic Success Coach Lisa Melz-Jennings, 60% increased their cumulative GPA and 38% increased enough to be moved to academic good standing. There are 465 students on academic warning or probation this semester; if OAS and Athletics students are subtracted from this total, it still leaves 366 students without a sport on academic warning or probation. Ms. Yager reported that all of these students are being contacted and offered the services of the academic success coach. Three College Student Personnel graduate students are doing their practicums with Advising this semester.

Faculty Senate – Dr. Perabo reported that the CCPI Review report was approved with the exception of a request by Faculty Senate for a definition of “program.” She related there was a lot of student distress over rumors that students might not be allowed to major and minor in the same department. This misinformation caused students concern about possible limitations on their autonomy regarding declaring a minor. Ms. O’Donnell-Brown asked if the report is on the website yet. Dr. Perabo responded that it cannot be posted until it is fully approved. Ms. Hamm stated that the report comes back to Faculty Senate on Tuesday, February 6, after which it goes to the President for final approval.

CGE: Chairperson Holz reported that CGE considered 17 articulation requests during Fall 2017; all but three were approved. Eight of the requests were from the Humanities, three from Natural Science, three from Social Sciences, one from the Humanities or Multicultural categories, and one each from Multicultural, Fine Arts, and Human Well-Being. Three requests have been received since the end of last semester; two of those were approved, and one is still pending.

Chairperson Holz is often asked when the General Education Review will be completed. He has not been given a firm due date but there is a strong desire to wrap up the review by the end of spring semester. Chairperson Holz would like to take a vote to see if CGE/GERC members are in favor of completing the review this semester. He has been invited to the Council for International Education meeting on Monday, February 5 to provide an update on the Gen Ed review. He invited CGE/GERC members to join him at 1:00 p.m. in Horrabin Hall 60. Chairperson Holz has also been invited to attend the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Council meeting on February 7 at 4:00 p.m. Drs. Pettit and Kelly will also attend to represent CGE/GERC.

#### Old Business

Continue discussion of overarching curricular proposals:

Chairperson Holz pointed out that one option is the existing Gen Ed curriculum, which offers quite a lot and will be used as a measure or standard against which other proposals can be measured. He proposed that the existing Gen Ed curriculum be considered Proposal 4, joining proposals already submitted by Drs. Shupe, Perabo, and Maskarinec. He stressed that it should always be remembered that this is a viable proposal.

Dr. Shupe’s Goal Focused General Education Proposal:

Dr. Shupe approached the problem by considering the overall goal for the review: to provide a general education for WIU’s students. She recalled the first GERC meeting discussed what its members want students to achieve from Gen Ed. She believes that when Gen Ed is discussed, WIU’s mission and vision statements should be kept in mind; then, consideration should be given as to how to achieve these goals, similar to writing a lesson plan. She pointed out that CGE has determined six goals that will help achieve the overall mission or vision of the University, and every Gen Ed course has to meet two of the goals, with some exceptions for goal #6. Dr. Shupe listed Gen Ed courses under each goal based on which two goals each course was assigned to assess. Instead of requiring students to have a certain number of hours for each Gen Ed *category*, students would need a certain number of hours to fulfill each Gen Ed *goal*. Dr. Shupe pointed out that GERC was charged to try to prevent siloing, and her proposal provides numerous courses for students to take to reach each of the goals; students can pick and choose, depending on the number of hours they need to meet the requirement.

Associate Provost Parsons asked if there will still be two goals assigned for each course. Dr. Shupe replied that her proposal provides the framework, and these types of questions are ones that can be considered and discussed; CGE/GERC can decide if all of these goals are still needed to meet the needs of students. Associate Provost Parsons pointed out that typically two goals are assigned per class, with the exception of certain Human Well-Being classes. She asked which goal would determine if a student has met the Gen Ed requirements for AAS 100, for example. Dr. Shupe replied that students could choose for AAS 100 to fulfill Goal 2 or Goal 5; depending upon which goal they needed the hours for, the student could count AAS 100 for credit for either one.

Chairperson Holz asked if in this proposal the existing categories would be eliminated and the 200+ Gen Ed courses redistributed based on fulfillment of the six goals; Dr. Shupe replied that they would. Dr. Allison remarked that Goals 2, 3, and 4 are skills that should happen in every Gen Ed class, so it seems counterintuitive to put courses into them separately. Mr. Zanolla remarked that just because a goal is not being assessed does not mean that it is not being done in the class. Dr. Shupe stated that if Goals 2, 3, and 4 are effectively the same, the question needs to be asked if they are all meeting students’ needs. She pointed out that it is the foundation of making a complete student to target different standards. Dr. Allison asserted that Goals 2, 3, and 4 are not the same but they occur in every class in different ways; in a physics class, they may involve learning to critically analyze in a different way from analyzing a piece of literature in a Humanities course. She stressed that the content changes but not the skill.

Dr. Shupe stated that her proposal provides students with the flexibility to find their passion without being overly directed. Associate Provost Parsons asked how many semester hours would be required for each goal; Dr. Shupe replied that this would be up for discussion. Associate Provost Parsons pointed out that a situation could occur where no science or English whatsoever was taken because there is no requirement to meet certain categories within the goals. She asked if a student could take all Art classes to fulfill Goal 3, for example, or all Geology classes to fulfill Goal 4. Dr. Shupe replied that her proposal is just a framework, and parameters can be put in place, such as students must use two different categories that are not the same to fulfill each goal. Chairperson Holz pointed out that if the proposal is still using categories then it would not be simply driven by the goals.

Dr. Baker-Sperry related that during the first Gen Ed review they developed categories based on the structure of the disciplines and then developed the goals based on what GERC thought a generally educated students should be, but the categories and goals were never intended to be the same. She pointed out that CGE/GERC may decide that human well-being is not a goal that the group wants to retain, but the humanities will never go away. Dr. Baker-Sperry stated that going from a disciplinary-perspective structure to a goals-based structure will be challenging because 1) it will be difficult to change the goals once this structure is in place, and 2) the goals are not reflective of the departments from which General Education comes. She related that when decisions were being made about which Gen Ed courses meet which goals, it was stated that courses could pick three, but factually they might meet five different goals. She does not think the current proposal is really reflective of what departments and disciplines do. Dr. Shupe countered that Gen Ed should be reflecting students’ needs, rather than those of departments, and what criteria fulfills those needs or experiences. Dr. Baker-Sperry stated that a generally educated student needs a broad education, and WIU assures that by retaining the specific disciplines and imposing over them the courses that CGE currently thinks are appropriate. She believes that if CGE chooses to go with a goal-specific curriculum, it will tie the Council’s hands and could become top-heavy or sideways.

Dr. Shupe was unaware that the assessment categories for courses in General Education could be changed; she does not think most people are aware of that. Associate Provost Parsons explained that the categories are how the University programs the disciplinary or content-orientated aspects of Gen Ed, but the goals are important for assessment; the goals are not dealing with content areas but with the assessment component. Gen Ed goals are how every course is assessed to see whether they are meeting the category areas, which is why departments choose which Gen Ed goals they want to assess and CGE confirms their choices. She added that departments are not choosing the category but rather are choosing how they will assess the goals in each category; the goal is the assessment component. Dr. Chamberlin added that class eligibility for Gen Ed is determined on the ability to achieve multiple goals. She explained that trying to shoehorn complex classes into one category evokes in the student the impression that the course is something that it is not. Mr. Markey remarked that he does not think most students know what the General Education goals are or could say that their Art History class is intended to help them analyze and think critically; students may learn those skills but they will not know that the course is aimed to achieve those skills.

Dr. Pettit pointed out that under the current proposal several students in a class could be taking it to meet three or four of the six goals, so various students would be fulfilling different requirements. He added that currently a Gen Ed course could occasionally fulfill Multicultural or Humanities, but with this proposal students in a single course could be meeting more than of the six goals, perhaps giving students a false impression that the course is aimed toward something that it is not.

Dr. Maskarinec pointed out that Goal 1 in the table is really comprised of three different Gen Ed categories (2, 3, and 4), which really need to be separated out. He added that a student could take all science classes to meet this goal. He pointed out that Goals 2, 3, and 4 are overarching goals, while Goal 5 basically corresponds to Category V and Goal 6 to Category VI. Category I, Basic Skills, seems to be missing in the chart, but basically the proposal seems to reflect the current category structure. Dr. Shupe pointed out that she was only trying to show what it means to meet certain Gen Ed outcomes. Dr. Baker-Sperry asked what the benefit of the proposed structure would be to students compared to the current structure of Gen Ed. Dr. Shupe replied that students would meet the Whole Wellness Model and know what they are achieving; she believes students should have knowledge of the area that they have mastered by taking a Gen Ed course. Dr. Baker-Sperry suggested that maybe what is needed is a way to provide more information to students rather than a structural change. Dr. Chamberlin remarked that Gen Ed syllabi should have goals and objectives listed, and those should be made clear at the beginning of the class. Chairperson Holz suggested that CGE could require that assessment goals should be included in syllabi. He believes this might force faculty to shape more of their course structure around teaching those goals.

Associate Provost Parsons stated that a Gen Ed class meeting several goals would be a programming nightmare. She related that the FYE Program tried a block class for ENG 180 and POLS 122, which is a great idea but not easy to do across all areas; doing it with just one set of classes was difficult. Associate Provost Parsons remarked that it is also difficult to have students in living-learning communities take the same class experience because someone must program this, and right now the University is short on programmers. She noted that with the Goal Focused Proposal, the undergraduate catalog would have to be completely reblocked. She predicted that advisors would see a lot more additions and deletions to student schedules if they tried to meet Gen Ed requirements in this way.

Dr. Allison noted that English classes could conceivably be taken to meet Goals 2, 3, 4, or 5, and it would not be fair for English to “game the system” in this way. Mr. Markey asked how the proposal would affect programs, such as Nursing, with pre-determined Gen Ed classes. Dr. Shupe replied that those classes would still fit under the goals. Associate Provost Parsons remarked that another issue would be transfer students following Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) guidelines. Dr. Baker-Sperry pointed out that assessment plans would have to be completely rewritten.

Chairperson Holz remarked he has never heard any dissatisfaction with the six Gen Ed goals in general, but he is struck by the radicality of the Goal Focused Proposal. He pointed out that one good thing that has come out of the discussion regarding the proposal is that CGE should entertain the possibility of requiring inclusion of the specific assessment goals in syllabi for Gen Ed courses in order to keep professors mindful of and underscore those goals. He believes that some faculty forget which goals are important for their Gen Ed courses. He suggested there should perhaps also be some thought given to elevating the writing standards in some of the Gen Ed goals. Chairperson Holz believes that the Goals Focused Proposal, however, would upend everything about the way Gen Ed is currently handled, and he senses that CGE/GERC members in general do not agree with all of the premises proposed. He suggested that the members vote on whether to continue with this first proposal or remove it from consideration.

**Motion:** To remove the overarching proposal on Gen Ed courses by goal from consideration (Maskarinec/Allison). Motion approved 13 yes – 2 no – 0 abstentions.

Chairperson Holz thinks there are some good ideas in the proposal, and pieces of it should be kept in mind as the discussion moves forward.

Dr. Perabo’s Essential Skills and Core Knowledge General Education Proposal:

Dr. Perabo explained her intention was to make explicit what skills and knowledge are being addressed in each of the Gen Ed courses, so she folded the concepts of essential skills and core knowledge into the existing categories. She pointed out there is a lot of overlap between her proposal and Dr. Shupe’s in what they are trying to accomplish with the Gen Ed goals; she agrees with Dr. Shupe that CGE/GERC needs to determine how any Gen Ed revision is going to look to students because the marketing piece is important.

Dr. Perabo separated Humanities from Fine Arts and associated a writing requirement with Humanities. She believes that the sciences may not be as focused on writing, and the arts may be focused on creative activities as opposed to writing, so a writing requirement may be more appropriate in the Humanities while the strengths of other disciplines can be highlighted in different ways. Mr. Markey questioned breaking Humanities/Fine Arts into two requirements of six hours of Humanities and three hours of Fine Arts. Dr. Perabo explained that this is the way the category was set up before 2007.

Chairperson Holz asked what the members think about adding the phrase “core knowledge” to every Gen Ed category. He has a lot of associations with the word “core” and feels ambivalent about the term. He asked if “core” is a term that everyone is clear about because it seems that there could be many connotations. Dr. Allison replied the term does not bother her; never has it entered her mind that core knowledge is canonical. She added that if the proposal were an internal document not going out to the state, use of that term would be fine, but “core” has implications to K-12 educators, and they might have problems with it. Dr. Perabo is not wedded to the word “core.” She thinks it is important to show that Gen Ed develops particular types of skills and focuses on particular kinds of knowledge. Ms. Bowers-Sharpe suggested that “broad” might be able to be used instead of “core”; Dr. Allison suggested the word “foundational.” Chairperson Holz observed that in the disciplines, core knowledge is descriptive, but when applied to UNIV 100 it is kind of a devaluing of “knowledge” since this course looks more at “knowledge of the University” in rather a schematic way as opposed to knowledge of the Humanities or Social Sciences. He thinks “foundational” might be a better word.

Dr. Pettit observed it seems like the members are quibbling over nomenclature without dealing with substance. He pointed out that if CGE/GERC rejects the substance, they do not have to worry about the nomenclature, and if the substance is accepted, the members can discuss it at that point. Chairperson Holz does not believe that people in the humanities could agree on what core knowledge is; Ms. O’Donnell-Brown stated that the humanities must have agreed on broad knowledge because that comprises the core of those courses. Ms. Bowers-Sharpe suggested “essential” might be a better word than “core.” Dr. Perabo stated that she is trying to get across to students that there are certain skills they should acquire and things they should learn about.

Dr. Day asked if there are any structural issues with the proposal. Mr. Markey stated that his biggest problem is the change to the Humanities/Fine Arts category. He likes the way it is set up currently, with the ability to choose the third class in this category from either Humanities or Fine Arts. He pointed out that Art History will have writing; Dr. Perabo agreed that Art History might be a possible exception. Mr. Markey asked if Music has been asked how this change would affect them if some of their majors are already expected to have 145 s.h. Dr. Perabo responded that CGE/GERC would have to look at specific cases if this proposal considered to be adopted. She really thinks Humanities are foundational to the University, so to possibly take only one Humanities class out of 145 s.h. seems like a really small amount. Dr. Perabo thinks teaching Humanities is part of what the University stands for; she really thinks Humanities should be a 9 s.h. requirement, but she will not propose that. Mr. Markey pointed out that foreign language is part of the Humanities category; he does not know how much writing they do, but learning a foreign language teaches the student as much about their own language as it does about the foreign language. Dr. Perabo said she would definitely give Humanities credit for any foreign language course, and many of the ones she took did require a lot of writing.

Associate Provost Parsons observed that 15-20 pages of writing is only required in the Humanities category; there is no notation in other categories, even in Communications, of the length of papers or amount of writing that needs to be done, which seems biased or narrow. Dr. Perabo recalled that it was discussed at the last CGE/GERC meeting that page number requirements may not be a good idea; some prefer that X percentage of a class should be based on writing, or that there should typically be essay exams. She believes there should be more than just one writing requirement that may not offer feedback because writing is one of the strengths of Humanities, so it should be clear as CGE/GERC articulates Humanities that writing be emphasized. Associate Provost Parsons asserted that writing is important across the University and is not specific to any one area; all students need to understand how to communicate through writing as well as orally. She would hate to see writing only be stressed for the Humanities, as if CGE/GERC is making assumptions that courses in other areas do not perform writing or do not hold it in high esteem. Dr. Perabo pointed out that there is a really minimalistic requirement right now; every class with enrollment over 50 has to have one writing assignment that may not be graded. Associate Provost Parsons pointed out that there are some Humanities classes with enrollments under 50. Dr. Perabo replied that the vast majority of Gen Ed classes are doing much more writing than the required minimum. Dr. Allison agrees that the Council needs to talk about writing, but she agrees with Associate Provost Parsons that it needs to happen everywhere. She thinks writing needs to be elevated across the board rather than just in one area, and she agrees that graduating with just one Humanities course is ridiculous.

Dr. Allison asked why Humanities should not be its own category since Social Sciences have their own category. She added that the same may be able to be asked about Natural Sciences/Mathematics. Dr. Baker-Sperry replied that the expectation during the last Gen Ed Review was that the amount of required Gen Ed should not be increased, so those combinations seemed to be the best fit. Dr. Allison asked why was more important to require 9 s.h. for the Social Sciences category. Dr. Baker-Sperry replied that no one came forward with a proposal to only take 3 s.h. of Social Sciences.

Dr. Allison absolutely believes every student should have to take a Fine Arts class, and stated that the proposal makes sense to her. Chairperson Holz disagreed; he is on the fence about requiring 6 s.h. of Humanities and 3 s.h. of Fine Arts, but he thinks that separating the 9 s.h. category weakens both parts of it. He believes that the current category offers parity with other broad disciplines and that Fine Arts and Humanities stand better together. Chairperson Holz does not mind debate on the semester hour requirements but strongly believes that it should remain one category so that there are four major pillars of area studies rather than turning Humanities into a small area and Fine Arts into an even smaller one. Dr. Pettit serves on the Humanities/Fine Arts GERC subcommittee and related that he made the argument that the category should be split up. He was motivated by the fact that the Gen Ed philosophy and goals seem different for the Humanities than they are for Fine Arts; they are covering different areas of knowledge. He remains in favor of splitting the category in two. Chairperson Holz asserted that creating a category that is 6 s.h. or 3 s.h. makes them appear weaker than they are currently. Associate Provost Parsons pointed out that the Human Well-Being category is only 3 s.h.

Ms. Bowers-Sharpe thinks it is intriguing that some courses – such as Art History or Music History – might be able to be listed in different areas than currently, which might solve some of the issues of those members who are on the fence about 6 s.h. or 3 s.h. She suggested the category could be left at 9 s.h. if some courses could be cross-listed or reconsidered because of their natures. She suggested, for example, that Art History might be better described as Humanities rather than a Fine Arts, which tends to be more performative. Dr. Allison remarked that a creative writing class could conceivably slip into Fine Arts because it is a creative production of something.

Dr. Maskarinec observed that structurally the Humanities and Fine Arts categories are different, but effectively they could be considered as one category with two subcategories with 3 s.h. and 6 s.h. requirements and keep the subcategory descriptions separate. He pointed out that in this way there would not be another category of only 3 s.h. Dr. Maskarinec would like to hear more from the Fine Arts side, such as whether Art History would be listed in both categories or whether it would have some sort of designation to show that it has a writing requirement.

Ms. O’Donnell-Brown pointed out that the writing guidelines for General Education courses states that “Although the type and amount of writing is best determined by the instructor and department, the Council of General Education will use the following guidelines when considering courses for inclusion in the general education curriculum.

1. For courses with an enrollment of 50 or fewer, students should have at least one written assignment with written or oral feedback from the instructor with an opportunity for revision.
2. For courses with an enrollment of over 50, students should, as a minimum, write short informal essays or responses to the course material that do not require feedback from the instructor.”

Dr. Maskarinec asked if this is a requirement for the Social Sciences, too. Dr. Perabo replied that an Economics or Biology course may be focused on other things and not do as much writing. The College of Arts and Sciences did a study on essential skills and found that on average Humanities courses tended to have more writing than others, which led her to make this explicit in her proposal. Mr. Markey pointed out that the University of Illinois/Urbana-Champaign has the same Gen Ed categories as WIU and separate their Arts category into two subcategories. Dr. Perabo agreed that some places combine these two areas while others separate them; it varies from institution to institution.

**Motion:** To table further consideration of the Essential Skills and Core Knowledge proposal (Allison/Maskarinec). No objections.

Chairperson Holz stated that discussion will continue on the Perabo proposal at the next meeting, including how to deal with specific areas such as the writing component, and then continue on to the Maskarinec proposal. He added that CGE/GERC also needs to discuss UNIV 100 again at some point because that has come up at recent Faculty Senate meetings. Associate Provost Parsons informed the members that Faculty Senate is establishing an ad hoc committee to examine UNIV 100 and Y courses in relation to the effect they have on retention.

Dr. Allison asked about item 11 under Future Business, “Honors College Gen Ed requirements and curricular offerings.” Chairperson Holz has been struck by the fact that these Gen Ed courses have not changed in 20 years, in some cases no longer correspond to WIU’s curriculum, and are missing in certain areas; for instance, that seminars are not offered in certain disciplines. Dr. Allison pointed out that disciplines can propose seminars; Chairperson Holz stated that Fine Arts proposes seminars in Humanities because there are none within Fine Arts. He does not think there are many problems, but he wants to bring the subject up for discussion. He added, however, that this is not in the GERC charge, so if the members do not want to review Honors Gen Ed courses then he is fine with that. Dr. Allison thinks this is an Honors College issue rather than a GERC issue, particularly since it is not within the charge.

**Motion:** To remove review of the Honors College Gen Ed requirements from Future Business (Bennett). Motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. O’Donnell-Brown would like to look at the subject first before deciding not to pursue it. Chairperson Holz thinks it would be good to be able to say CGE/GERC reviewed them because this affects one-tenth of WIU students, and the Honors Gen Ed curriculum is not always in alignment with that of CGE.

**Adjournment**

 **Motion:** To adjourn (Perabo/Shupe). Meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.