

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES

December 18, 2013

Evald 305

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 PM.

Members Present: Carolyn Hough, Janene Finley, Nathan Frank, Mike Egan, Jeff Ratliff-Crain, , Brian Katz, Rick Jaeschke, Katie Hanson, , Lendol Calder, Meg Gillette, Eric Pitts (SGA), Liz Perez (SGA)

Absent: John Pfautz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson , Stefanie Bluemle, Jacob McManus (SGA)

Guests Present: Christina Myatt

I. Recognition

Congratulations were extended to Mike Egan and Janene Finley for having received tenure.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion- Brian Katz moved **“to approve the minutes of the December 11th meeting as submitted.”**

Katie Hanson seconded.

Discussion was opened. It was noted that Janene Finley was shown as present when she was actually absent and that in one section “learning outcomes” had been mistakenly typed as “learning incomes”. As there was no further discussion, a vote was taken.

MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 11TH MEETING WITH CORRECTIONS.

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

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion of the LP Sub-Committee's Proposal Document

Brian Katz reviewed the proposal as submitted.

Discussion ensued.

The question was asked about what the process was to developing the signature questions. The sub-committee responded that they came from their sub-committee and are really just a model. It is their intent to seek input from others.

The question was asked how the sub-committee envisioned that input happening? Would the discussion be part of the forums? Is one forum that is focused on LP signature questions ok? The suggestion was made to have one overarching meeting and then breakouts as this has worked well for other campus topics.

It was thought that perhaps getting the question right could help to form a community between folks who teach the various LPs. For example LSFY folks meet, but LPs do not.

There is room for faculty development opportunity by using this signature question.

The question was posed, is PN's question too broad? While some understood this concern, they believed that once you use the "using tools and questions of the perspective" part of the question, it would help to zero in on the coursework.

Does it make sense to have catalogue language which explains LPs change to questions? Are we drawing on the language in the catalogue or are we saying that we are recreating the descriptions? It was thought that the explanations are part for students and part for faculty. Just giving the questions may not offer a more comprehensive view for students about the coursework.

The sub-committee offered that we are really proposing a pedagogical change to how things are taught rather than a changing of what is in the course.

The question was brought up about reducing the LP requirement from 9 to 6. Discussion ensued.

This change was originally brought forth as it appeared there was no clear reason for 9. We were asked to look at reducing the footprint. Some members noted that originally the number was determined because it resulted in that about one third of one's time at Augustana would be fulfilling the Gen Ed

requirements.

Discussion seemed to indicate that even those in agreement are concerned that it will be the red flag that gets concentrated on.

It was offered that there are two different questions? Are we reducing footprint or simplifying Gen Ed? It seems like we are simplifying rather than reducing.

The discussion moved to eportfolios. While we are definitely moving in this direction it was thought that this change may be further away than the scope of this proposal.

We can think about the way integration is handled through LPs but integration is actually bigger than just LPs and perhaps bigger than Gen Ed.

It was suggested that maybe we have Stage One as proposed and then Stage Two is assessment. Some thought that we could just have stage one with an assessment component.

Several members of the committee thought that there may be some discussion about if integration is really what we want.

It was suggested that we may want a note to mention eportfolios and the need to look at it for the future so that we at least acknowledge the language of the the strategic plan.

There were questions and discussions about the reasoning for and type of eportfolio we are really looking for. Academic? Professional? It was said that eportfolio was actually originally more focused on professional portfolios. The committee as a whole agreed that what we are really looking for is not clear.

B. Update from Academic Affairs

There were no updates given.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENT

Our next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, January 15 at 4:00 PM in Evald 305.

Our timeline:

Week 6-we will again meet in subcommittees

Week 7- we will reconvene as whole and discuss the big components of the document

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no additional business the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina Myatt