

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
December 12, 2012  
Olin 304**

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

**Members Present:** Richie Benson, Stefanie Bluemle, Joe Bright, Lendol Calder, Patrick Crawford, Kristin Douglas, Mike Egan, Janene Finley, Meg Gillette, Rick Jaeschke, Virginia Johnson, Brian Katz, John Pfautz, Eric Pitts, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson

**Guests Present:** Mary Koski

### LSFY COURSE APPROVALS

1. **LSFY 102: The Making of the Modern Subject from Montaigne to Miss Piggy [France]**

Motion to approve: Johnson 2<sup>nd</sup> Crawford. Motion withdrawn.

**Motion to send back to faculty. Johnson 2<sup>nd</sup> Crawford. Motion carried.**

Discussion:

This LSFY-102 course was approved by the Governance Prep Group and was being discussed for permanent approval. There are several aspects of the course that the LSFY subcommittee would like to see further clarified. First, we would like to know more details of how process writing is being taught: how is They Say/I Say being used, explicitly state how assignments and common components of the course are included in the framework of teaching process writing (provide more details on the course calendar), how are the response papers being used, how do the response papers contribute to the final paper? The subcommittee would like to know more details about the research paper.

2. **LSFY 102: From Cultural Borrowing to Imperialism and Nationalism [Zhao]**

Motion to approve. Jaeschke 2<sup>nd</sup> Bright. Motion withdrawn.

**Motion to send back to faculty. Johnson. 2<sup>nd</sup> Crawford. Motion carried.**

Discussion:

This LSFY-102 course was approved by the Governance Prep Group and was being discussed for permanent approval. The overall sentiment of the subcommittee was that the course reads like a history course, not a process writing course. The learning outcomes are strongly disciplinary. The vision of LSFY courses is that they are to be nondisciplinary and skill focused. To meet these criteria, this course will need rethinking. Common features of LSFY102 (They Say/I say, the museum visit, symposium day) were not discussed in the syllabus or proposal materials. The syllabus seems to be a course that was taught at another institution, because there are several centers mentioned in the syllabus that do not exist at Augustana. The subcommittee was disappointed to see "See syllabus" as answers to proposal questions. Questions need to be addressed in a careful articulate manner. "See syllabus" is unacceptable.

It was unclear from the materials provided how process writing is incorporated into this course. There are reading responses and 6-8 page papers, but it is unclear how writing skills will be addressed in these assignments.

Finally, the subcommittee would like to see the overarching question of the course stated as a question.

### 3. LSFY 102: The Trojan War From Homer to Hollywood [Day]

**Motion to send back to faculty. Jaeschke 2<sup>nd</sup> Gillette. Motion carried.**

Discussion: There are many aspects of an LSFY-102 that are missing from the syllabus. For example, a library visit, museum visit, incorporation of They Say/I Say are all missing. Furthermore, there were no assignments in the submitted materials.

These materials should be resubmitted with attention to detail. In addition to the common features listed above, the subcommittee would like to see goals and outcomes listed on the syllabus along with detailed information explaining how process writing is being taught. Finally, the subcommittee would like to see the overarching question of the course stated as a question.

#### **General Comments:**

The LSFY subcommittee would like to see the LSFY coordinator as the sign-off person for LSFY courses. Many issues with course proposals could be identified and discussed with faculty prior to submitting their proposals to Gen Ed for approval. This would decrease frustration for faculty in having to submit and revise multiple times. The committee also discussed creating detailed template syllabi for LSFY102 and 103 to demonstrate assignment breakdown for process writing as well as library visit timing, due dates, etc. that seem to work well. Additionally, we would like to see a question about process writing included in LSFY proposal questions. The subcommittee discussed the overwhelming LSFY matrix and a need for a stripped down matrix for each LSFY term.

After reviewing LSFY courses that were initially approved via GPG, the LSFY subcommittee would like to suggest that faculty teach their GPG approved course and make modifications to the proposal/syllabi that they plan to make prior to teaching the course a second time. The hope is that Gen Ed would approve a course that is closer to the course that will actually be taught.

Finally, the subcommittee briefly discussed the value of hiring LSFY Fellows rather than fellows under different departments to teach in LSFY.

#### **LP-PLUS COURSE APPROVALS**

##### 1. **CLAS 365 for a "G": Angels & Demons – Paganism and Christianity in the Literature of Late Antiquity [Hooker]**

**Motion-Katz, Second-Egan**

**"To remove from the table CLAS 365: Angels & Demons – Paganism and Christianity in the Literature of Late Antiquity [Hooker] for a G."**

**MOTION TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE CARRIED**

Discussion: The committee asked for wording from last week's minutes as to why this course was tabled. 12-5-12 meeting notes were as follows:

Discussion: Mischa Hooker responded to Gen Ed's reasons for not approving the G suffix on 11-14-12. One member expressed that Mischa's follow-up letter contained a "kernel" of an answer that convinced him that the G requirements were satisfied. It

seems the information is there, but members on the Gen Ed committee do not necessarily understand it.

Another member commented he was not convinced this course will help students develop an informed global perspective. The course is more of a PP or PL, as students will learn about history and literature.

Mischa argues in his appeal to precedent set in granting several Art History courses the G suffix, Margaret Farrar indicated that the reason those Art History courses were approved was that eventually the syllabi came to the committee containing a lot of information about the culture itself; the social context in which the art was produced was part of those. She asks if Mischa is doing the same thing in his syllabus.

Margaret suggests that the committee is not ready to make a decision on this proposal. She asks that the committee re-read the proposal and the letter of appeal, the minutes from 11-14-12, and perhaps investigate Solar Henotheism.

Referring to when the last Art History course was approved for a G, Rowen said the argument was made then that there was some comparative substance to the course, and that may have had an impact on the committee's decision to approve the G. The current sub-committee is not convinced Mischa's proposal has that element.

Speaking on the G and D in general, Brian Katz commented that when the Gen Ed committee begins the "Re-defining G and D" discussion again, it occurs to him that there are three perspectives that define G and D, not two (diversity and global); although if regrouped differently, it could be two. To him there is: 1) race, gender, identity-kind of diversity, and 2) globalization and the interactions of different countries that have to do with the non-Western, the non-United States.

Brian Katz commented that Mischa Hooker's proposal reads to him as a 'D'. It is about understanding the mix of two different religious groups and understanding them from within by reading their literature and understanding how they constructed an identity. Mischa focuses a lot more on the literature (and this course does carry a PL), but secondarily the course seems to be a D. Brian argues that as the G and D definitions are currently written, identity can fit in either category, which is why he believes there are three elements: globalization, identity in the United States, and identity out of the United States.

Courses designated by the G suffix focus significantly on the differences between U.S. traditions and those that are culturally distinct from them. Mike Egan argued that Europe is not culturally distinct, especially if the era being studied is before the United States was even founded. This course focuses on the art, music and religion of Europe, which is the dominant cultural tradition.

Brian commented that Mischa's appeal said that Gen Ed's only concern was that the proposal read 'crucible of Western culture.' For Brian, what made the G suffix appropriate for the Art History course became about understanding the identity of the individuals who were creating that from within. It wasn't just about looking at paintings and understanding one particular person or something, but was about understanding the identity of those people from within themselves. It is about something that is supposed to be there, and he sees that thing present in Mischa's proposal.

John Pfautz asked in what circumstance would any course dealing with antiquity qualify for a G suffix? Does the committee think a G suffix has to do with the then-and-now, the now mostly? For Mike Egan, the G is about intercultural competence, like in the global world that we live in

today. It is about preparing our Augustana students who are largely European stock, to be able to be competent if they interact with someone from Asia, Africa, etc., very distinct regions of the world.

John Pfautz adds that the underlying conversation is that we assume globalization has to do with now, has to do with modern. If that is true, then this should be stated somewhere in the definition.

Referring to John's word "antiquity", Mike Egan would reverse that argument. If a course was based on Mayan culture from 800 of the common era to 1200 of the common era and was part of the Latin American Studies program, he can imagine that even though it is historically-based because it talks about how that culture developed and how that culture fed into modern Latin American society to a certain extent, then he might say "that is a G course" even though it is based 1,000 years ago, because it is a distinct culture from the dominant Western culture.

None of Augustana's history courses that currently have a G are based in Europe. They are in Asia, Africa, Latin America.

Brian's argument for the G is that given the definition currently says 'globalization', and understanding the other for both G and D, he can see this being a valuable course that does exactly that in a productive way, that it helps students understand the identity of the other, particularly in the pagan portion. The G component is more likely to succeed if it is paired with something that they think will be origin because it is already in conversation with something that they might think of as the origin of their own religious tradition. Brian feels this course is well set up to help them understand the other, which is exactly the skill or outcome he feels a D or G course should have.

The answers to questions 1 and 4 on the suffix proposal form are weak responses, question 2 is a strong response, and question 3 is a weaker answer.

Rowen commented that 'within the U.S.' means within the U.S., not a couple thousand years earlier.

**Motion-Egan, Second-Pfautz**

**"To call the question."**

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION CARRIED**

**Motion-Katz, Second-Hough**

**"To APPROVE CLAS 365: Angels & Demons: Paganism and Christianity in the Literature of Late Antiquity [Hooker] for a G suffix."**

**MOTION FAILED (2 ayes; 5 nays)**

Brian Katz told Rowen that when she communicates with Mischa that the committee was somewhat split on this, to also tell him that Brian would be happy to talk with him, as someone who sees potential in his appeal.

## 2. MUSC 401 for a “D”: Music of Faith: Some Images of Jesus [Dakin]

**Motion-Pfautz, Second-Finley**

**“To approve MUSC 401: Music of Faith: Some Images of Jesus [Dakin] for a “D” suffix.”**

Discussion: The committee was impressed with Deborah’s response to its concerns and they are convinced that diversity will be looked at throughout the entire 10 weeks of the course. The instructor indicated that this course will only be offered once.

**MOTION CARRIED**

### **BEGIN DISCUSSION OF G AND D**

Speaking on the G and D in general, Brian Katz commented that when the Gen Ed committee begins the “Re-defining G and D” discussion again, it occurs to him that there are three perspectives that define G and D, not two (diversity and global); although if regrouped differently, it could be two. To him there is: 1) race, gender, identity-kind of diversity, and 2) globalization and the interactions of different countries that have to do with the non-Western, the non-United States. For the one that feels like “D”, Brian proposes that it shift from within the United States and outside the United States, to one being about identity and one being global dialogue, different culture. John Pfautz argues that they are not distinct because global issues about gender would be overlapping.

“Identity” could be used as an umbrella term for the one that feels more like the “D” (shifting the definition from being inside the United States to being about identity and a global dialogue between different cultures) which could include national identity, gender, sexuality, race and religion. Both sexuality and gender should be used because they are different things. How gender plays out is immensely affected by race and religion as well. To know the sexuality of man depends on whether he is Catholic or Muslim. The people who study social theory on campus (inter-sexuality, inner-sexuality) talk about those categories individually, and how they overlap to create social structures.

Brian reminded the committee of the argument he made last year that he would rather some student study race and gender by how it plays out in Chicago in some way that connects with them, as opposed to requiring that they do one of those and also study Asia. For him it seems more likely they will get generalizable traits if they pick things that are proximal. Rowen added that if a student studied diversity within the United States and culture in Asia, the student would have a broader frame of reference. Brian hears students talking about how they “learned something about Asia”, but it does not accomplish cultural competence; it comes across to the student as a collection of facts they know about Asia.

John Pfautz agrees that a three-credit course does not distinctively or automatically make a person’s world view that would be considered ideal or broader than what they had before, but it does carve out a path that helps them learn more about others in the world. For example, the student studying Asia hears about conflict arising in Nepal, they have a better understanding than someone who studied race in Chicago because they have some tangential information to draw upon. Their world view has changed, even though they may not be able to articulate much more than dates, and things they saw. Their overall understanding of life has been cultivated. He believes it is true, however, that a student can go on foreign term and just be a tourist and not learn much about life or the world.

Rowen said it could be that both G and D will be part of intercultural competence, not one or the other.

John Pfautz contemplated a learning community that has one course a G and the other a D as a requirement to cover the inter- and intra- learning outcomes. What would that look like? What are the commonalities? What discussions could occur and what outcomes? Is this a worthwhile thought? It is

likely impractical, as there currently are not enough faculty willing to offer learning communities, and that is unlikely to change. Brian would prefer that G and D are done at separate times. When students start the second one, after going through the first one, it is very different. Hopefully they are being encouraged to transfer the understanding the other and themselves. Explicitly starting over at a higher level seems intuitively more likely to lead to desired outcomes than if done simultaneously.

Rowen made a note to have a future discussion about starting these integrative learning communities and possibly having more interdisciplinary approaches or clusters. May be G and D will fold into that.

Brian added that Mike Egan's point about thinking of world globalization for the G, the word 'globalization' is a modern term that has to do with how things used to be local city-states, and now there is dialogue between large groups of people who consider themselves to be quite different. Perhaps we could use that language to make G into something different than just where it is located, that it is something more about modern need to understand how to interact with people from other countries.

Mike added that it would eliminate the need to review G proposals that are based in antiquity. G courses should help our students be more inter-culturally competent.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski and Kristin Douglas