Minutes taker: Novotny Lawrence

Present:
1. Chair / HS: Kelly Reddy-Best, associate professor, Apparel, Events, Hospitality Management
2. LAS: Novotny Lawrence, associate professor, Greenlee School of Journalism and Communication/English
3. Design: Jane Rongerue, associate professor, Community and Regional Planning
4. Grad student and CELT rep: Paul Hengesteg, program evaluation coordinator (CELT) and PhD student in School of Education
5. VP for student affairs reps (x2): Jen Leptien, director of Learning Communities
7. VP for student affairs reps (x2): Bill Boulden, associate dean of students/director of Greek Affairs
8. Multicultural students leadership council: Jordan Brooks, director of Multicultural Student Success, College of Design and PhD student in School of Education
9. Engineering: Diane Rover, university professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Apologies:
1. Vet Med: Carrie A Berg, associate teaching professor of Biomedical Sciences
2. CALS: Kurt A. Rosentrater, associate professor, Agriculture and Biosystems Engineering
3. Business: Monica Gordillo, teaching professor, Management and Entrepreneurship
4. Student government rep: Blake Van Der Kamp blakevdk@iastate.edu, Agricultural and Life Sciences Education

Kelly called the meeting to order at 10:03

Topic 1: Pre-meeting document review- In preparation for the meeting, Kelly created document outlining meeting etiquette. Novotny made a motion to approve the document and Diane seconded it. The committee voted and the motion passed unanimously.

Topic 2: Committee charge; spring 2022 goals; and rubric development- Kelly explained that the committee’s charge is to create a rubric that will be used to evaluate existing and newly designed classes to ensure that they meet the University’s U.S. diversity requirements. She also proposed the following tentative schedule to complete the rubric.

- Committee work will occur between August 15 and May 15; potential schedule
  1. March 28:
  2. April 4: draft rubric
  3. April 11:
  4. April 18: edit rubric draft
  5. April 25:
The committee discussed the timeline, considering whether it is realistic, the importance of keeping U.S. diversity class instructors in mind when creating it the rubric, and the person(s) responsible for reviewing classes to determine if they meet the U.S. diversity course requirements.

The committee reviewed the following list of questions that Kelly designed to begin the conversation about creating the rubric.

Questions to consider:
- What percentage of the course needs to meet each of the three objectives collectively?
- How will voting happen and who votes on if a course passes or not?
- How will feedback be given to courses that do not meet the standard?

The committee discussed the questions, raised others, and also shared various perspectives/concerns about designing of the rubric. The main themes that emerged from the conversation were how we would create the rubric; existing templates that we could use to help design the rubric, the time allotted for completing the rubric; ensuring the rubric is instructor friendly; philosophical considerations in designing the rubric; our definition of diversity—making it clear that courses should center on social justice issues such as race, class, and gender, among others; Is there are specific pedagogical design that courses must adhere to?; ensuring that courses meet 3 of the 4 criteria to be considered a diversity class; percentage of diversity-related content that classes should include; reaching out to faculty currently teaching diversity courses to ask how they demonstrate that their classes meet the diversity requirements.

After the discussion, the committee decided to include additional meetings in the timeline to make certain that it will be able to complete work on the rubric. All meetings will take place over the remainder of this semester, and possibly one week after it ends. Because faculty are not on contract during the summer, there will not be any meetings during that time.

In her role as process monitor for the meeting, Jane provided an opportunity for members who did not speak during the discussion to share their perspectives. Additionally, she added to the meeting etiquette guidelines, asking that people share their names when making and seconding motions.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00