

General Education Committee Meeting
February 1, 2012
UL 1116
Presiding: Kathy Johnson

Present: Enrica Ardemagni, Sarah Baker, Tom Davis, Margaret Ferguson, Susan Hendricks, Stephen Hundley, Kathy Johnson, Carole Kacius, Jennifer Lee, Amy Maldi, Kyle McCool (for Deb Mesch), Lisa McGuire, Kathy Visovatti-Weaver, and Jeff Watt

Johnson welcomed committee members and distributed a copy of the revised common core model. She explained a few changes that were made in the model. The revised model addresses most of the concerns expressed at the last two meetings. All documents are available on Oncourse.

The pink layer of the model represents school requirements, and these requirements are determined by each school. The suggestions in the pink area align with the mission of the campus and with the life sciences emphasis. The gray area represents program requirements. This area might be larger for professional schools.

The big question is what goes in the common core area. Johnson said the Indiana Core Transfer Library is something to consider (available on Oncourse). A suggestion has been made that there should be a faculty committee to oversee the common core to authorize courses. This would need to be approved by the Indianapolis Faculty Council.

Johnson asked for comments and concerns about the revised common core model. The following points were discussed:

- How will prerequisites fit in the common core? Some may fit, but others will not.
 - Foundational courses should not be put in the common core.
 - Will common core only work with a list of designated courses?
 - There was a consensus about the categories, but concerns with how to make it work.
- What about students who change their majors? This may be an advising issue.
- Schools determine what courses are required. Foundational courses should not be part of the common core.
- General education should fall outside of the major and school requirements. The smaller the common core, the more flexible schools can be.
- Should the analytical requirement be broadened?
 - Herron does not have a math requirement, but other schools do.
 - Should statistics be included?
 - Any analytical requirement must be above Core 40.
 - If the analytical requirement remains at 9 credits, it could be broadened, but it should not allow students to retake math courses they should have had in high school. Remedial courses should not count either. Perhaps the requirements could include calculus, finite, and statistics courses?
 - Could Herron have a waiver or require a different type of analytical course?

- Should the core communication requirement be changed to 3 credits?
 - Many other courses integrate communication skills, particularly writing and speaking.
 - Most other committee members disagreed with this, arguing that students struggle with writing skills.
- Should the cultural understanding requirement be reduced to 3 credits?
 - Most courses in this category pull from the humanities and social sciences. Should the humanities be reduced to 6 credits?
 - Should speech be dropped? They get this in high school. This would reduce core communication to 3 credits.
 - Should this area be more focused?
 - This area included foreign language courses, which integrate cultural understanding as part of the course curriculum in accordance with national standards.
- Will the common core discourage students from pursuing minors?
 - Schools can opt out of the core, but at some point down the road there is a possibility that it may not be optional.
- Are there conflicting messages with the common core? One side seems to say one size fits all. The other side seems to say get students out the door with 120 credits.
- Will curriculum begin to get watered down? There are demands from the state, from businesses, from parents, from students. What does a degree mean if students do not acquire essential skills? The pink area should be what it means to get a degree from IUPUI.
- The pink area represents curriculum owned by the schools. The gray area represents programs. The white area will be overseen by a committee such as this one.
 - There is some commonality between the schools in the pink area. This is an area that can be branded, such as using RISE.
- Should pink area be suggestions rather than requirements?
 - Schools determine what goes in the pink area.
 - Should subheadings be removed? Or should there be just a gray and white area?
 - First-year seminars are not in white area (as common core) because it would increase the credits in that area.
 - Pink area should show that IUPUI is producing well-rounded students.
 - Should pink area just show PULs?
 - Many faculty are not familiar with the PULs, let alone students.
 - Between the common core and the pink area, all the PULs are in the model.
- In the pink area, should “school requirements” be changed to “school competencies”?
 - This works if schools are allowed to waive requirements.
 - In the School of Nursing, this term could be confusing, but they can accept using this.
 - There doesn't need to be a one-on-one relationship between the items in the pink area and actual courses.

- The capstone and first-year seminar are not skill sets. Is there a different way to represent them?
 - Should the model go back to the pie? Should there be two pies?
- Do the PULs need changed to better reflect this model and the common core?
 - There is great reluctance to change PULs.
 - Should we determine what is in the common core first and then re-examine the PULs later?
 - No academic structure lasts forever. After accreditation, the case can be made that it is time to move on.
 - We would not be starting from scratch this time.
- We are facing threats. We need to be able to say what an IUPUI degree means.
- Should the pink area take out the numbers (or recommended number of credits)? Should the category say “suggested school requirements”? Or should we leave off word “suggested” and just allow schools to waive what they want?
 - Johnson asked everyone to send her specific suggestions on the wording.
 - Should it be “suggested core competencies” instead?
- Should the black dot in the middle say “integrative learning and PULs”? Or just “PULs”?
 - There should be a copyright symbol after “PULs” since other places are copying this idea.
- Should the title of the model be “Model of Integrative Learning”? Or “The IUPUI Model of Integrative Learning”?

Johnson explained the next process. There will be another meeting tomorrow. Johnson hopes to create an amalgamation of this model with all of the suggestions. It would be helpful if everyone could show Johnson what the common core would look like for their schools. She will then compare this to the Indiana Core Transfer Library. Johnson needs to get something out to the campus community soon. She hopes to hold a town hall in March. Everyone agreed to get her their information about the common core recommendations by the end of February. There was additional discussion about the report that came from the task force, including sampler courses and all schools being represented in the curriculum committee.

Submitted by:
A. Snyder
University College