**Academic Affairs Committee**

**Minutes**

**Wednesday, November 4, 2020**

**6:00 P.M.**

**VIRTUAL MEETING per state law and Governor Pritzker’s Executive Order**

**Call to Order: 6:02**

**Roll Call**:

* Blum Present
* Cline Present
* Lahiri Present
* Mainieri Present
* Nikolaou Present
* Peterson Present
* Harris Present
* Phillips Absent
* Spranger Present
* Toth Present
* Hurd (Provost’s designee) Absent
* Paolucci (UCC liaison) Absent

**Order of Business:**

1. Approval of committee minutes
   * Documents provided to committee members in advance of the meeting: *Minutes#5AAC10.21.20*
   * Changes: Cline needs to be marked as present
   * Motion to approve: Peterson
   * Second: Cline
   * Roll call vote:
     1. Blum Aye
     2. Cline Aye
     3. Lahiri Aye
     4. Mainieri Aye
     5. Nikolaou Aye
     6. Peterson Aye
     7. Harris Aye
     8. Spranger Aye
     9. Toth Aye
2. Invited Speaker for the IDEAS Graduation Requirement Proposal:

**Dr. Rocio Rivadeneyra**, Interim Chair of Communication Sciences & Disorders, Chair of the U.S. Diversity Ad Hoc Committee

* Opening remarks by Dr. Rivadeneyra to provide context for the committee
  + Original committee
    - Access came in with intention to include ability
    - Diversity was defined very broadly
    - Audit of current classes that could count as an IDEAs course
  + Got feedback via CRCC sessions, focus groups, and survey, all given to UCC
* Can you give us insight about what the planning group envisioned by access and how they saw that represented in the outcomes?
  + Did not have a SAAS representative
  + Disability is one of the markers of difference in the first outcome
  + Only certain Special Ed classes would be appropriate
  + Senator Blum concern about how robustly access can be covered in an IDEAs course
* How do you envision the IDEAS courses addressing the learning outcomes to count as an IDEAS course– all? A certain number of outcomes? A certain percent of content?
  + Committee never quantified
  + Wanted most of them to be covered
  + Proposal would be a body that would decide if a course would fit or not, like AMALI
  + Lowest the committee got to as they reviewed courses was covering 4 of the 6 learning outcomes
  + As requirement comes in, envision that some faculty will revise their syllabi to more explicitly demonstrate how they address the learning outcomes
* Did the committee discuss majors that are maxed out on credit hour requirements?
  + Census of how many seats would be available in the courses that we thought would fit this requirement
  + Committee found that there would be courses that students were already taking that could count
* IBHE requirement that all public institutes of higher education to include in the Gen Ed requirements coursework to include human relations to address racism and sexual harassment on their campuses – any transfer student would already have this requirement
* If we acknowledge that most students will be doubling up on a current requirement, what is the wisdom of doing this requirement this way as opposed to doing it in the revamp of Gen Ed?
  + The courses are there and available, but not all students are taking them
  + The revamp of Gen Ed will be a long process and don’t think we should make our students wait
* How would you respond to folks who might say that IDEAs is not enough?
  + Ideally we would have this content infused throughout every course
  + This is a first step
  + It is broad enough but doesn’t add extra burden for students, which in itself would be an equity issue
  + Need the right instructors to teach these courses, which becomes difficult with a universal DEI course
  + We are saying that this is important and that we’re not shying away from these conversations
* Is there any quality check for the faculty teaching these courses to ensure that these courses truly fit the values of diversity and inclusion?
  + Professional development for faculty will be important
  + Important to make sure that the faculty teaching these classes have expertise in these areas
* Was using existing courses a compromise for financial concerns?
  + Need sufficient capacity to start the requirement
  + Funds would need to be identified as the requirement and capacity needs evolve
  + Need a structure so that faculty who teach these courses have the support they need
* Do we need language in the proposal about the structures that are needed for this requirement? Without acknowledgement of those needs, could be problematic for folks voting on this item
  + Short- and long-term goals on President’s website gets at those requirements
  + Most important to this proposal: faculty professional development and faculty evaluation based on DEI initiatives
* What is our timeline?
  + Committee hopes to get it to the Senate in January

**Motion to adjourn: Harris**

**Second: Toth**

**Adjourn: 7:00**