

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**2/3/2010**  
**Olin 304**

The meeting was called to order at 5:00 PM.

**Members present:** Tom Bengtson, Allen Bertsche, Fred Whiteside, Anne Earel, Ashley Booth, Virginia Johnson, Kristin Douglas, Alli Haskill, Dan Lee, Margaret Farrar, Randall Hall, Joe McDowell, and Josh Morgan.

**AGENDA ITEM I: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve minutes from the 1/27/10 meeting. 1- Dan , 2- Fred; APPROVED

**AGENDA ITEM II: NEW BUSINESS**

- A. "G" suffix approvals for Art History
1. ARHI161- Western Art in Perspective
  2. ARHI162 -Nineteenth Century Art
  3. ARHI367- Twentieth Century Art
  4. ARHI369- British Art

Motion to approve ARHI 161, 162, 367, and 369 for a "G" suffix; 1- Allen; 2- Anne APPROVED

*Discussion:*

A question was raised for the courses that addresses American art- do these really meet the "G" criteria?  
Response: Because there is a comparative element to these courses, there is precedent to support them.

- B. PL & G WLIT310-LC Landscape and Literature

Motion to approve WLIT310-LC for a "G" suffix (the PL has previously been approved); 1- Dan; 2- Virginia APPROVED

*Discussion:*

This course already carries a PL, we are only considering the "G."  
The course meets our current "G" requirements.

- C. Immersion term LC courses: for discussion purposes only (voting will occur during finals week)

What to expect: Heine & Geedey's course is only seeking an LC suffix; Storl & Harrington are seeking an LC, PP, and PH.

We will take an additional week to read both proposals and discuss them next week. Next week is when the divisions will vote on these proposals. Gen ed will need to vote electronically on the proposals during finals week.

- D. Update from Academic Affairs

Immersion terms and grant update: By the end of spring there will be a presentation to the faculty by Reuben, Ian, Kevin, Heidi, and Margaret. The board of trustees recently heard a presentation about immersion courses and they were very excited about them.

Immersion courses are not the only model- several high impact projects are possible. See Margaret or Jon Clauss for additional information about possible programs.

Week 10 Friday conversation: What do we know about LSFY? What do we know about the program and how should we use data to guide future instruction and possibly reform LSFY?

E. Continued discussion about LSFY

Discussion of email from Dan Lee (see below)

*A DISCUSSION PROPOSAL FOR REVISING OUR GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS*

1. *Replace LSFY 102 and LSFY 103 with a first-year topical seminar (with a wide variety of topics, as determined by instructors) with strong emphasis on the development of critical skills. First-year students would take the seminar either winter term or spring term.*
2. *Make LSFY 101: Rhetoric and the Liberal Arts a prerequisite for the first-year seminar.*
3. *Make completing LSFY 101 and the first-year seminar prerequisites for Christian traditions classes.*
4. *Reduce the LP requirement to one course in each category.*
5. *Replace the three additional LP courses requirement with a requirement that three skills-intensive courses be taken beyond the sophomore year (which could be LP suffixed courses). NOTE: There is a case to be made for making this a skills-intensive requirement, rather than simply a writing-intensive requirement since speaking and critical reasoning skills are also part of what our general education system is intended to foster.*

Under the current system, most majors currently take LPs outside their major, which many on campus view as a positive aspect of the system. If we changed the LP requirement, many majors would receive most or even all of their LPs within their major. It would be advantageous for students to be able to take courses outside their major (i.e., WGS majors could perhaps get all of their LP courses within the major with no need to take additional courses outside the major.)

Counterpoint: For students with a major that has multiple LPs offered, perhaps they could take additional electives of interest.

Another suggestion: Could this problem of certain majors satisfying multiple LPs be solved with a cross listing approach for which Webadvisor could cap the number of courses with a given department code?

Where would LCs fit into the discussion of LP reductions? Many of the LCs offer LPs, however, because we've had so few LCs offered, most students take more than the required number of LPs because by the time students are able to register for their LC, most have already satisfied their LP requirements.

We need to be clear about what we want LPs to achieve. Breadth of perspectives?

We will assume that students within the major to have a strong command of the predominant perspective in the major (e.g., science majors; most majors tend to be dominated by one of the perspectives.)

Where do we put our priorities for AGES in the coming year? A benefit of last year's conversation at the retreat was a renewed interest in LCs. What other components of the AGES program do we then need to change? We likely cannot do it all. Because LCs are a priority across campus, we will need to reduce another aspect of the program.

Students who have received LC credit because of foreign term perhaps should be restricted from registering for LCs to free up spots for others who need the courses to graduate.

One rationale for requiring multiple courses in an LP was for students to gain a deeper understanding of a particular perspective. Reducing the additional 3 LP requirement would negate this original intention of the program.

A course code cap may need to be reconsidered if certain majors satisfy multiple perspectives (i.e., may need to raise course code credit cap from 40). It would be difficult to lower the course code cap though— problems already exist with certain majors (e.g., science majors already do not include labs in their credit load because of course code caps).

Students are not having problems fulfilling LPs (with the possible exception of PH courses), but they are having trouble registering for LCs. One problem is that students always overestimate how many seats will be available for LCs. Another problem is that student schedules make LCs a challenge to fit in.

There are many merits to our current LSFY system. Cutting LSFY sections from 3 to 2 would not be without its problems. There have been some successes with the current model. For example, we've been able to identify concerns with our FY student cohort. Much thought has gone into the skills progression between the 3 courses. That kind of progression has been working effectively (honing new, sequential skills within the program). It's exactly those features that make these courses less disciplinary but highly beneficial.

Another consideration as we reconsider LSFY: Cathy Goebel has been active nationally with promoting the museum's connection to our LSFY 102 program and it is viewed by many as being innovative and important.

Perhaps LSFY courses should be a priority in the AGES program and we should shrink other aspects of the program. However, just shrinking LP requirements may not be sufficient. How do we ensure faculty participation?

Dan's proposed two course seminar model (1 writing courses and an additional writing-intensive course-retaining the skills development focus) is common in peer institutions. Because of the peculiarity of our 3 term calendar, having three courses in the first year makes sense.

On one hand we are committed to the interdisciplinary nature of our LSFY courses, but on the other hand, we need to consider how we balance skills development with interdisciplinary perspectives.

The LSFY program has morphed over the years from the interdisciplinary model to the skills focus model. This evolution has been due, in part, to efforts related to recruiting instructors.

There is research to suggest that distribution models aren't effective. This philosophy, in part, guided our move from departmental offerings to a Perspectives model. GEWG tried to end the turf war model of the old distribution model. We should keep this in mind as we continue our conversations.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The next meeting is scheduled for Feb. 10, 2010.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10.