

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**

**MEETING MINUTES**

December 4, 2013

Evald 305

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

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

Absent: Jacob McManus (SGA), Meg Gillette, Stefanie Bluemle

Guests Present: Christina Myatt

NOTE: It was noted for the record that in lieu of a meeting the week before (due to Thanksgiving Break) members were asked to review the items on the consent agenda. Emails were sent letting committee members know that unless someone asked for any of the items to be removed, it would signal their approval of the consent agenda. No items were put up for discussion and the Consent Agenda for November 27 (consisting of two LSFY proposals and a proposal for a G suffix) was approved.

**I. Approval of Minutes**

Motion- Rowen Schusheim-Anderson moved **“to approve the minutes of the November 20th meeting as submitted.”**

Brian Katz seconded.

Discussion was opened. There were no corrections/additions, a vote was taken.

**MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 20TH MEETING AS SUBMITTED.**

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

**II. NEW BUSINESS**

EPC has asked Carolyn to go to their meeting to talk about the proposed AGES changes. As we don't have a document, she will walk them through the background and the major areas we are working on and will field questions.

**III. OLD BUSINESS**

**DISCUSSION OF THE ICC SUB-COMMITTEE'S PROPOSAL DOCUMENT**

The first two pages of the document is what is proposed to go to the faculty. In reality, it could just be page two.

Discussion ensued about the term culture. It was thought it might be better to be explicit rather than implicit. The more it is spelled out, the easier it is for faculty to see how their courses could fit this requirement.

Some questioned the phrase "marginalized and oppressed" There was some concern that many much of the terminology approached the subject matter from a negative connotation. Some wondered if people may find the terminology to be offensive.

There was discussion about how specific descriptions should be. It was generally agreed that each time there is a new generation of Gen Ed, there is some difference in perspective and choices. If the language is left a little more general this allows for new perspectives/takes on wording as the group changes. It was also offered that if the wording were too specific it might take away some thinking and creativity.

It was thought that the biggest component should be addressing the learning outcome/competency we wish students to achieve. In proposing classes, faculty should ask how

this class moves the student towards this competency?, How will the work and ideas move them forward?

It is our hope that students would come to an understanding of a large set of overarching questions.

There was a suggestion that the committee remove the section which refers to the Augustana population.

The question was asked about other courses that while fitting the spirit do not fit the current description. For example, a course on "whiteness" which would cause people to examine things and take them out of their comfort zones would seem to fit the intention but does work with the current description.

The following suggestions were proposed:

Add a phrase about "deeper understanding of the notion/construction of cultural difference"

Add the phrase, ""Culture may be represented but not limited to ethnicity, religion, politics, economics, or creative expression."

The committee was reminded that this is a change, we are not simply replacing D and G with ICC. This is the only real "change" in the proposal. LCs work is expanding definitions, LPs is more of a clarification. The move to ICC is a definite change.

These changes would go into effect for 2015-2016 and would have a faculty development component.

It was questioned if we needed to add something to say that ICC is for all areas of curriculum.

Mike Egan asked that everyone continue to share their thoughts and to add suggested edits to the document.

Mike Egan asked if this could be shared with EPC.

We still need to continue fleshing out the description and formulating the answers to the questions that are proposed. It was suggested that the question, "What happens to current D and G courses?" be added to the list.

We hope to be able to offer resources for faculty who are looking for direction in how to address the new ICC requirement in their courses.

As we continue working, people were again asked to share their thoughts. The more dialogue that happens and differing viewpoints that are shared, the better prepared we will be to handle the questions of the full faculty.

#### **IV. ANNOUNCEMENT**

Our next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, December 11 at 4:00 PM in Evald 305.

We will be looking at the LC sub-committee document.

Carolyn will share the work being done for the AGES revision at EPC and will start the ICC conversation but will stress that this is a draft and it is still being revised.

#### **V. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no additional business the meeting was adjourned at 5:03 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christina Myatt