

Council on General Education
September 11, 2008

Present: William Thompson, Phyllis Rippey (chair), Steven Bennet, Candace McLaughlin (ex officio), Judi Dallinger (ex officio), John Miller, John Simmons (visitor), Douglas Huff, Amy Carr (visitor), Betsy Perabo (visitor), Sean Cordes, Sarah Haynes (visitor), Kathleen O'Donnell Brown, David Haugen, David Casagrande, JoAnne McEneany (visitors), Donna Williams (visitor)

- 1 Phyllis: Welcome to new members.
- 2 Phyllis: Thanks to various persons.
- 3 Phyllis: Annual report was accepted by the Senate.
- 4 Phyllis: Introduces: Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies classes for consideration.
 - 4.1 Amy Carr: We want to deepen our course offerings.
 - 4.1.1 We thought we would break up World Religions (201) into two offerings, one focusing on Islam, Judaism and Christianity; the other covering Buddhism and Hinduism.
 - 4.1.1.1 David Haugen: Didn't the History Dept have a question about the need for its students to be informed about certain religions?
 - 4.1.1.2 Amy: We addressed those issues with the Chair of History.
 - 4.1.1.3 Sean Cordes: Under course objectives of 110 it mentions "three religions."
 - 4.1.1.4 Amy: That was a mistake.
 - 4.1.1.5 John Miller moves to accept both courses.
 - 4.1.1.5.1 David Haugen seconds.
 - 4.1.1.5.2 Unanimous approval for both 110 and 111
- 5 Phyllis: I'd like to entertain a discussion of the Writing Committee Report.
 - 5.1 Bill makes crazy ambitious proposal to create Institutional Repository to study student writing or, slightly less crazy, to study syllabi.
 - 5.2 Amy discusses some of the drawbacks of the survey.
 - 5.2.1 Low return rate
 - 5.3 Amy discusses some results:
 - 5.3.1 Many people don't seem to give feedback
 - 5.3.2 While there is writing going, not necessarily a lot of paper writing.
 - 5.3.3 FYE classes don't seem to be giving as much writing as one would think.
 - 5.4 Douglas Huff: I like the idea of studying syllabi. Lots of information available there.
 - 5.5 Phyllis: Discusses problems / challenges regarding obtaining syllabi
 - 5.6 Amy: Discusses ambiguity of "opportunities for revision etc," as regards studying syllabi.
 - 5.7 Amy: Discusses value of receiving written / oral comments. How meaningful is this for students?
 - 5.8 Phyllis: Discusses class size and expectations regarding writing.
 - 5.8.1 As FYE becomes more institutionalized, should there be an overlapping of expectations for writing vis a vis Gen Ed.
 - 5.8.2 Judi addresses FYE writing expectations.

- 5.9 Phyllis: Two issues: What is going on in the curriculum? Are our expectations realistic, proper, etc.
- 5.10 John Miller: Do instructors know what the writing expectations are?
- 5.11 Phyllis: We sent out a STARS message last January with these expectations. Every faculty member received this.
- 5.12 John: Maybe send the communication to the chairs then from chairs to faculty?
- 5.13 Jim Schmidt: Chairs are not often the best conduit of information—for various reasons.
 - 5.13.1 Jim: Telestars also has its flaws.
- 5.14 Phyllis: Three areas of discussion:
 - 5.14.1 Communication of our message
 - 5.14.2 What is happening in the classroom?
 - 5.14.3 What are our expectations in re: writing?
- 5.15 Jim: If the data you get isn't generalizable, you really can't assess.
 - 5.15.1 We can randomly sample Gen Ed sections to study what they are doing with their writing.
 - 5.15.2 Phyllis: Stratified sample
 - 5.15.3 Jim: Acknowledges idea
- 5.16 Jim and Phyllis: Discussion of removal of the "W" requirement.
- 5.17 Discussion of how to learn what kind of writing is going on.
 - 5.17.1 Do we do a random sampling of courses and talk to the faculty involved?
 - 5.17.2 Douglas Huff: I'd like to look at syllabi and ask questions if the information is vague.
 - 5.17.2.1 David Casagrande: Discusses limitations of syllabi study.
 - 5.17.3 Kathleen: Did we survey the chairs about studying syllabi?
 - 5.17.4 Phyllis: Not as such.
 - 5.17.5 Phyllis: Let's establish a writing subcommittee: Bill, David, Doug?
 - 5.17.5.1 Reconstituting the Writing Subcommittee:
 - 5.17.5.1.1 Bill, David, and Doug are on the committee.
- 6 Illinois Articulation Initiative
 - 6.1 Judi discusses WIU's non compliance with IAI.
 - 6.1.1 IBHE proposes that IAI Gen Ed Core Curriculum be sufficient for certain classes of transfer students.
 - 6.1.2 Judi some would like us to extend the IAI to all groups of transfers. We don't have to do that.
 - 6.2 Phyllis: We require multiculturalism and human well being. The IAI doesn't. That's our six hour difference between IAI and Gen Ed.
 - 6.3 Judi: IAI has more math in its requirements than we do—so some students might prefer our Gen Ed.
 - 6.4 Phyllis: We really don't have a choice regarding students with 30hrs of transfer credit in these certain areas.
 - 6.5 Judi indicates this is the case.
 - 6.6 John Miller: Asks for clarification.
 - 6.7 Judi: even now they don't have to take Multiculturalism or Human Well Being —any six hours of gen ed will do.
 - 6.8 David: Did WIU talk with the IBHE about this?
 - 6.9 Judi: Yes. And this letter is the result.

- 6.10 Joanne McEneaney: Another school said it wouldn't comply. The IBHE said it would talk with the Provost of this school. I don't know what happened.
- 6.11 David what's the core issue?
- 6.12 Phyllis: Facility of transfer of credit.
 - 6.12.1 There is also a question of an institution's core identity in re: its choice of curriculum. The IAI homogenizes curriculum across the state.
- 6.13 Judi and Phyllis discuss IAI and its relationship to WIU.
- 6.14 David: How many students?
- 6.15 Judi: In fall 2007, 135 students with more than thirty hours.
- 6.16 Phyllis: Definition of transfer student.
- 6.17 John: It is disturbing to me, and has been, that we have made a practice of giving Western Degrees to people who don't meet our requirements. I don't want to encourage this by allowing *all transfers* to use the IAI gen ed.
- 6.18 Phyllis: Two questions:
 - 6.18.1 Will we endorse the IAI agreement in re these certain classes of students?
 - 6.18.1.1 David: Do we have to *endorse* this proposal. Can we simply *acknowledge* it
 - 6.18.1.2 John: Why are we uncomfortable with being out of compliance? We have been out of compliance for a while.
 - 6.18.1.3 Joanne: If we don't follow IAI, we might not be available for HECA grants.
 - 6.18.1.4 Judi: This directive from the IBHE in re IAI is student friendly.
 - 6.18.1.5 John: You could say it is student unfriendly because it doesn't prepare students for the world they will be living in.
 - 6.18.2 David Casagrande: Could we ask that the students be required to do multiculturalism and human well being?
 - 6.18.3 Phyllis: discusses.
 - 6.18.4 Jim: I started out feeling like John Miller. Now, I find it difficult to feel that those six extra hours are that important—especially in light of whether a student is coming to WIU or not. If the six hours are that important, colleges can require it for their curriculum—as the College of Arts and Sciences does.
 - 6.18.5 Bill: Moves that, after council's discussion, we pass the IAI directive on to the Faculty Senate for its consideration.
 - 6.18.6 David Casagrande: seconds
 - 6.18.7 Motion passes unanimously.
- 7 Letter to Departments in re: Assessment of General Ed.
 - 7.1 Kathleen: I have some comments.
 - 7.2 Phyllis: Do we have Unanimous consent?
 - 7.2.1 It is given.
- 8 Consideration of Psychology's Assessment of Gen Ed
 - 8.1 Phyllis: Any problems with Psy 357?
 - 8.1.1 No objections.
- 9 Consideration of Communication 130 Assessment of Gen Ed
 - 9.1 Phyllis: Any objections?
 - 9.1.1 No objections.
- 10 Consideration of Theater and Dance 101
 - 10.1 Phyllis Any Objections?

- 10.1.1 Judi: I'm confused as to what is being measured? They're a bit vague.
- 10.1.1.1 Judi and Phyllis discuss how critical thinking engages with meeting the multicultural goals.
- 10.1.1.2 More discussion about critical thinking and humanities.
- 10.1.1.3 Judi: Goal two is fine but four is not. They have to have a more reflective understanding of critical thinking in this context.
- 11 Theater 110
 - 11.1 David: I have no idea how number 1 works in this context to measure broad understanding.
 - 11.2 Sean: The writing is poor and vague. I can't follow the meaning of some of the sentences.
 - 11.3 Phyllis: ATF help will be sent to theater.
 - 11.3.1 Judi will arrange this.
- 12 Biology
 - 12.1 David: This is way too complex.
 - 12.2 Judi: Discussion of Goal 1.
 - 12.2.1 Phyllis reminds us of what we required for Physics.
 - 12.2.2 Phyllis: Any objection to Goal 1?
 - 12.2.3 Discussion of Goal 4.
 - 12.2.3.1 Phyllis: I will remind them that they will have to collapse all the data into one number.
- 13 Consideration of Art Plans (180, 182, 283)
 - 13.1 Phyllis: Any Objections?
 - 13.1.1 David: The outcomes are the same for both goals 2 and 3
 - 13.1.2 Phyllis: I will communicate the problem.
 - 13.1.3 Kathleen: I don't understand the rubrics / descriptions for all the classes.
 - 13.1.4 John Miller: Maybe they don't understand what we are asking.
 - 13.1.5 Phyllis: We have offered the Assessment Task Forces skills to departments. Maybe we should do that with Art.
 - 13.1.5.1 Judi will contact Art Department in re: ATF help.
- 14 New Business:
 - 14.1 Phyllis gives preview of the Sept 25 meeting.
- 15 Phyllis: Meeting adjourned at 5:08 PM.