

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
REVISED MEETING MINUTES
January 23, 2013
Olin 304**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

Members Present: Lisa Allen, Stefanie Bluemle, Joe Bright, Lendol Calder, Patrick Crawford, Kristin Douglas, Mike Egan, Janene Finley, Meg Gillette, Carrie Hough, Rick Jaeschke, Virginia Johnson, Brian Katz, Eric Pitts, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson

Guests Present: Mary Koski

1. "PN" for GEOL 106: Earthquakes, Tsunamis and Eruptions in Asia [Wolf]

Motion-Egan, Second-Hough

"To approve a PN learning perspective to GEOL 106: Earthquakes, Tsunamis and Eruptions in Asia [Wolf]."

MOTION CARRIED

2. LSFY 103: Lennon and More: Utopian Visions [S. McDowell]

Motion-Gillette, Second-Jaeschke

"To approve new course LSFY 103: Lennon and More: Utopian Visions [S. McDowell]."

MOTION CARRIED

3. President Bahls' Objectives

The committee was asked to identify issues that the Gen Ed committee could work on that were presented in President Bahls' talk to the General Education Committee on January 16, 2013. Rowen indicated that issues identified at today's meeting are relevant to our discussion and can be mapped out into learning outcomes so it can be shown where things fit in with what is already happening in general education. Because President Bahls felt that marketing the college is an issue that needs to be worked on, Rowen began with that discussion.

1. Transfer Agreements for Students with an Associate Degree

- Does data exist on how its working? President Bahls indicated that data shows transfer students with an associate degree coming to Augustana earn better grades. A current Augustana transfer student feels that all his gen ed requirements should be considered fulfilled when he transferred in with an associate degree. Should this kind of attitude be of concern?
- The strongest history major student is a transfer student. Does that mean a certain kind of person wants to come to Augustana? Why do we ask them to prove anything?
- Do we consider requiring a gateway course for beginning of junior year. One currently exists: LSC 201, which is a quick introduction to liberal arts and the library. Virginia commented that our transfer students do not get a true orientation to the college through this course. It is not an academic orientation, but more of a welcome with some information that may make things easier for them. Virginia would like to poll transfer students with that question.

- Consider reducing the number of general education requirements for transfer students?
- Two choices which may attract more transfer students:
 - 1) Go to distribution system for general education requirements
 - 2) Stop front-loading general education in the freshman year. Students would take general education courses in junior year, allowing more courses in their major earlier. They are more mature in junior year and may value their general education courses more.
- A member requested to see a copy of the articulation agreements. Kristin indicated there is only one institution we have an actual agreement with. It is the hope that articulation agreements will be made with other institutions as a way to attract more transfer students. A student with an associate degree is more likely to transfer to a school that considers their general education requirements as being fulfilled, than choosing a school that requires transfer students with associate degrees to take additional general education courses after matriculating. Currently Augustana's Registrar's office evaluates every potential transfer course a student requests to transfer, and matches those courses up to Augustana's courses that fulfill general education requirements.
- The idea number of transfer students is unknown. President Bahls indicated that it should be a sizeable part of the student body.
- Augustana recruits poorly from community colleges and can improve.
- Does the Gen Ed Committee have authority or input in policy-making whether or not transfer students have reduced general education requirements?
- Does eliminating general education requirements for transfer students dilute the liberal arts experience?

No additional points from President Bahls' talk were brought up for discussion.

G AND D DISCUSSION

Carrie Hough's G and D email from the past week (1-20-13) was a G and D conversation starter. This committee increasingly has been sending G and D proposals back to the faculty for revision. The current G and D language is too ambiguous. The faculty could be doing more with G and D to make these rigorous courses as well.

On Carrie's "Rethinking the D and G Suffixes" document, under "Some Thoughts on the Current D and G Guidelines", #1 fits with the spirit of G and D and thoughts about areas we are challenged with the proposals. #3 addresses that. #1 and #2 are Carrie's ideas how we can potentially strengthen what we do and #4 addressed issues of G's getting G's because they are not elsewhere. Two models are included to rethink differently what this could look like. Her concern is that we say 'this is what we do and this is enough.' She disagrees and the NSSE data supports her claim. The NSSE data that Augustana scored low in has to do with student interaction with people who are different from them.

Carrie responded to John Pfautz's comment (email of 1-23-12) about using "anthropology-ese" language. Carrie indicated that she did not try to write the document using "anthropology-ese", and does not feel there is jargon contained in it. She kept in mind lots of other people and courses when writing this and does not believe that the ways she is suggesting we might rethink this fall into her disciplinary purview. Many faculty in many disciplines across campus are thinking about diversity in the context of power.

Mike Egan found John Pfautz's arguments (email of 1-23-13) appealing in that the power thing is a developmental goal. An encounter stage might be developmentally more appropriate. You need to encounter difference before you want to unwrap root causes of difference. Is it appropriate to jump right into a power structure when you have not even had an encounter yet? Others agreed with Mike. Could students be encountering difference without our policing it?

Should the committee be concerned that this vision will narrow the focus so much that we won't have G and D? There is an assumption here that the instructors that are teaching D courses come at the world with the power perspective. Lisa Allen indicated that she would not feel prepared to teach at the level Carrie suggests. Carrie believes there are enough faculty who could offer D suffix courses this way.

Brian brought up another model that has been talked about where one perspective is an identity one and another, a globalization one.

Carrie said her point is not to see difference as something we can just feel good about or appreciate and move on from there, but critically interrogate it. Appreciation is not necessarily critical thinking. Lendol added that it may not be critical thinking, but it also is not useless.

Mike Egan indicated this vision feels somewhat in the PS realm, social-sciencey. Is this a vision for another way of defining the PS? This question about power and positioning is a fundamental way of understanding society and persons and place within society. Mike was unsure with moving ahead this vision for G and D at the moment...perhaps because it may privilege the PS perspective.

Rowen feels this way to look at power is important, but it is not the only way to go about it...it leaves a lot out.

Virginia stated 'it's like when you study something side by side you identify and see the differences, but there is no understory of why there are differences.' Carrie said this notion of comparison is important. When we talk about diversity and global issues, we need to know why the things involved are different. Virginia suggested a way to vision this is there could be an encounter issue, which is the more comparative issue, and there would be a second, a dynamic diversity issue. One would be less complicated, but there is still exposure. What Carrie is attempting is to make it important that students understand the dynamics.

For it to feel students are making progress on diversity they need to analyze difference, and do something which might imply theoretical perspective. Brian is not convinced that it has to be power.

Carrie stated that with the D, so much of what we talk about is race and class. When we think about what gets a G, it is gender, sexuality and religion. How do we talk about these things in the context of diversity and difference if not through the lens of power?

The ultimate goal is of this conversation is to figure out what our curriculum needs to do to deliver the intercultural competency learning outcome. Rowen assigned the committee to look back to the mapping chart made on January 10, 2013 and think of areas President Bahls talked about to see if they are relevant to our discussion of mapping them with the learning outcomes and to bring ideas to the January 30th meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Koski