

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

October 9, 2013

Olin 304

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 PM.

Members Present: Carolyn Hough, Nathan Frank, John Pfautz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson, Stefanie Bluemle, Janene Finley, Lendol Calder, Meg Gillette, Mike Egan, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, Katie Hanson, Brian Katz, Rick Jaeschke, Eric Pitts (SGA)

Absent: Danica Gray (SGA), Jacob McManus (SGA)

Guests Present: Christina Myatt

I. Approval of Minutes

Motion- Janene Finley moved **“to approve the minutes of the October 2nd meeting as submitted.”**

John Pfautz seconded.

As there was no discussion, a vote was taken.

MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 2ND MEETING AS SUBMITTED.

Christina Myatt will file the approved minutes with Mary Koski in Academic Affairs.

II. NEW BUSINESS

Update from Academic Affairs

The global learning conference Jeff attended was not as helpful with the work we are doing as he had hoped. The conversations which had the most impact on his work here were the distinctions between broader aspects of “global” and “diversity”. Reflection at the end seems to be a key component.

Lendol mentioned that he had attended a workshop about study abroad and inter-cultural competency. He will share rubric they were given with everyone via Google docs.

III. OLD BUSINESS

Sub-Committee Reports re: AGES update and guiding questions

Each Committee conveyors reported and then opened the floor to comments, questions, and suggestions. Knowing that we could not get through everything in an hour, but want everyone to have opportunity to provide input, documents will be posted on the Google drive for committee members to continue discussion.

ICC Sub Committee- Mike Egan

The committee reached consensus that the model created last year is a great starting place as we replace D and G with ICC 1 and 2. One ICC is experiential based, study abroad or service learning type experience.

The committee looked at Friday Conversation and other meeting notes. They stepped back a little and looked at what we are trying to accomplish. The consensus was that terminology is still difficult.

The committee recognizes that while we can't do everything, what are the most important things to capture? Our efforts are making a concerted effort to answer a particular learning outcome that faculty has already agreed to.

The question was asked about if the committee had talked at all about LSFY 103. This is one thing the committee has not spent much time on but will revisit.

Achieving Intercultural Competency in two classes is difficult. All departments have classes that can build on that. Looking back with reflection is a great teaching moment. Building on prior work may cause the “light bulbs” to start to go on.

It was felt that at least one ICC class needed to be experiential. Current rubric states that experiential is 25% of total course work. Is this reasonable? Is any percentage daunting?

The question was raised as to whether or not foreign language would meet the ICC requirement. The committee believes that 100 level courses would not fall under this, however upper levels could.

Questions:

1. What's most important to capture?
2. What are people afraid of?
3. LSFY 103?
4. What do we use to measure/assess?

LC Sub Committee- Carolyn Hough

Integrative learning is not one currently of our learning outcomes. It is required that all students are minimally taking one LC.

The committee looked at AAC &U's definition of learning and from the spirit of that definition is thinking of LCs as our definition of integrative learning.

Right now, LCs are structured as: more conventional, 3 credit and 3 credit, can be adjacent terms, 3 plus 1 credit with service learning, and a few other options.

Can we expand model of LCs to include not just service learning but an experiential learning? This could be research, application of skills (like accounting with audits), or other experiences.

The question was asked as to where these experiences would come from?

The committee believed they would come from within department. That research opportunities could be developed by the department. There would still be some kind of partner in the community- acting as a mentor or leader.

The question was raised as to whether these opportunities could be a branch of the internship office?

Questions:

To what extent is the "community" aspect important? How is community being operationally defined? Is there potential for removing the community requirement from LCs? The committee is looking to loosen the definition but remain in the spirit so that more people will be able to offer learning communities.

E portfolios- What can we do beyond the course level? Think about things more holistically. How do we encourage students to do something more integrative with what they are learning? As the concept of e portfolios has crept into strategic planning documents, it raises questions which we cannot come up with answers for. Why do we want them to do it? What is the point? What questions are we asking students to address?

LP Sub Committee- Brian Katz

Originally the committee wondered if LPs are doing anything. It is their belief that since there is no coherent vision of LPs, if we try to assess something we will get a random smattering. The committee would like to try to articulate a more coherent vision for LPs. The committee is very sensitive to the fact that one course in a discipline is not likely to create competency in that perspective. Perhaps we can ask the faculty to pick a particular part of that perspective. Ask questions related to that perspective. Ask historical questions; ask questions about the natural world. If we can push everyone to emphasize one small thing, they would have at least some sort of common experience. If those "nuggets" are phrased similarly, it may stimulate integrative learning. Then we could ask students to contrast that.

The committee is also sensitive to not wanting to make requirements so specific that only a few people could teach that class.

This would be accomplished by writing new version of proposal forms. The new forms could then be used for assessment.

Questions:

What is the charge? If we had data to say the LPs are not working, could have greater basis for change. The committee met with Mark Salisbury. He suggests not assessing first.

Can we present the changes in a way that makes it seem easier? Simplifying the faculty workload is perceived better than adding to the workload.

Can there be Friday conversations, personal conversations or such to gain buy in to these changes from the faculty?

IV. ANNOUNCEMENT

Our next meeting will be Wednesday, October 16 at 4:00 PM. At this meeting, we will once again break up into our three subcommittees.

Agenda, minutes and any other supporting materials will be available by Friday before the meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no additional business the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina Myatt