

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
March 13, 2013
Olin 304**

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

Members Present: Richie Benson, Stefanie Bluemle, Joe Bright, Kristin Douglas, Mike Egan, Janene Finley, Jessica Hilbert, Carrie Hough, Rick Jaeschke, Virginia Johnson, Brian Katz, John Pfautz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson

Guests Present: Mary Koski

1. The committee welcomed Jessica Hilbert, who is filling in for Eric Pitts Spring Term.

2. **Consent Agenda**

The following items were approved by the General Education Committee 3-6-13:

1. PA for ART 235: Design Sources: Joined by a River [Schussheim-Anderson]
2. PP for CLAS 240: Women in Ancient Greece [Day]
3. G for CLAS 240: Women in Ancient Greece [Day]
4. PS for CLAS 340: Women in Rome [Day]
5. PH for ECON 365: Chinese Economy [Zhou]
6. PS for POLS 318: China in World Affairs [Zhang]
7. PP for LTAM 320 ~~LAS XXX~~: Listening 'Brazil': Popular Music in Context [Masterson-Algar]
8. PA for ENCW 201: Writing Poetry [Daniels]
9. PA for ENCW 203: Writing Creative Nonfiction [Daniels]

3. **Discussion of G and D for Friday Conversation**

John Pfautz distributed a rubric he obtained at a General Education and Assessment conference. It has some interesting ideas about global awareness and global perspective that relate to Augustana's ongoing discussions. Also provided were 2 pages from a PowerPoint that went along with the conference's presentation. Kristin passed out list of Augustana courses with D and G suffixes, sorted by 100 level, 200 level, etc.

John Pfautz combined data from the information he collected and wedded them to Augustana's recently approved 2-page Student Learning Outcomes, specifically the Intercultural Competency section, and designed a new rubric to be used as a framework for assessment of intercultural competency (Attachment A). This new rubric is designed so that it can follow the developmental, two-tier approach, going from benchmark to capstone.

It is his hope that committee members will take the week to synthesize this and discuss it with others within Gen Ed and with an instructor of a G or D course, or one who teaches on study abroad for their response. This will give us something concrete to present at the April 5th Friday Conversation.

It was asked would the rubric's "Introductory" column be benchmark or pre-, where students would be before they took any of the courses we might call Intercultural Competency courses (like G and D)?

John indicated "Introductory" could not be a whole class, but either the day students enter Augustana or combined with the second column "Exploratory", to give them a starting point. How that relates to

language is that it gives their foreign language departments some input into this, but it also gives students an opportunity to say they have some experience and that it counts towards something intercultural. They will not get credit for it, but they will receive affirmation that they have some skills towards these. This does not address, however, students who have not studied a modern language.

A suggestion was made that instead of just saying “Language” it would include: “Has had some experiences with people unlike themselves or people from different backgrounds.” The G and D definitions use the word “subculture” (which no one favored). Also suggested was “Groups”.

Some committee members expressed their thanks to John for doing this work. They like the fact that it is explicitly mapped on to learning outcomes that Augustana faculty have already articulated as opposed to the idea rubric which is vaguely connected to our learning outcomes.

We could start with the individual “How do I navigate our diverse and changing world” and expand upon that. We could claim influence in three courses instead of two if LSFY is used. Introductory is where many of them come in and then 103 does exploratory, the next one is participation.

Concern was expressed about relying on LSFY to teach this because of how overburdened LSFY is currently, and also because there is a constant struggle getting enough instructors to teach LSFY. Even though it is called diverse and changing world, many LSFY sections do not deal with diversity. If diversity requirement was put in, we risk losing a lot of courses, especially since there is not a good representation of difference disciplines teaching LSFY. A response to that was that if LSFY 103’s theme is “diverse and changing world”, then that is what should be happening. If it isn’t, it should be themed something else and “diverse and changing world” should be moved elsewhere in the curriculum.

Because this is the first substantive change Gen Ed is considering, this will be embedded in bigger changes within Gen Ed, so it could be that the whole system will look different. If there are fewer courses, that may translate to fewer components that general education offers, which may draw people into other critical areas. On the other hand, some believe that if the number of learning perspectives were reduced, students will stop enrolling in courses in certain disciplines which would be a detriment to those departments. Also to keep in mind is that while learning outcomes have these four parts, Gen Ed does not have to cover all four of them; they may fit into the rest of the curriculum.

Kristin asked opinions of whether or not to separate intercultural competency from global learning from global awareness from being a global citizen. Are those two separate things or are they the same thing? Are we trying to make them the same? It seems that being a global citizen, being an international citizen, means understanding economics, politics, interdisciplinary topics which we do not currently have as part of our general education program. Are we trying to accomplish global citizenship, or are we trying to accomplish intercultural communication. One comment was that they should be treated separately.

Discussion of retaining D and G:

- I am for dismantling D and G as they stand. The language has always been problematic. There is no great nomenclature for talking about western and non-western anymore. Global and local is the simplest and easiest way to talk about it. Biggest concern has always been that a course needs to move a student more toward a competency and interacting with people in the world. Thinking about gender relationships in the world is great, but it is part of what we think about in terms of building skills in students that they can apply in their lives.
- One concern about losing D and G is we lose idea of non-western.

- With the current D and G, if a student takes MUSC 107 for a G and a RELG 260 for a D, my hunch is that student will never get to the last column having taken those two courses. But, if a student took Intro to Sociology and later on took a course where they are spending time in an inner-city area engaging with African Americans all the time, that would be awesome. That student would probably be up to those levels without having considered what is going on overseas. I can also imagine a student taking Music 107 and then going to Ghana and getting up to these levels. I advocate for ICC1 and ICC2 and getting rid of G and D.
- If we are talking about choosing between a dichotomy of local/global or developmental/introductory, I choose the latter. It seems more likely to get the outcomes you look for.
- There is sentiment to move forward toward the developmental model of ICC1 and ICC2 and do away with G and D. Should a local versus global approach be considered?
- The bad thing about G and D is that it is called G and D...different language would help.

Without taking a vote, the committee reached consensus to focus on the two-tier developmental approach with two courses that will not be tied to Diversity and Global as they are now, but on developing skills on two different levels.

The document Kristin prepared with number of courses with the D or G designation indicates there are twice as many G as D and twice as many upper division as lower. It is likely that some of these courses will have to be retired if we get serious about assessing courses based on outcomes. But if a concern is we have twice as many G courses, chances are good that students will be getting that global perspective more than a local diversity perspective.

Study Abroad Discussion

Close to one half of our students study abroad and one-third of our faculty teach on study abroad programs. This is very high in comparison to other schools, and is a real strength that Augustana offers and is something we can promote. How many of the G courses are 300 or 400 level courses taught on study abroad? Hopefully study abroad will not decrease if there was no D or G courses and no global requirement. And hopefully a third of our faculty remain interested in teaching abroad so that the college doesn't lose. If this committee is ready to make this change there must be a strict rubric for courses that get the ICC designation through an assessment process. Most of the overseas programs would likely claim the ICC2 level. Since it is mostly juniors and seniors going overseas because of Augie Choice, it may be a boon to study abroad, as it is the easiest way to get a learning community and may be the easiest way to get the ICC2 course as well.

For next week the committee was asked to review the new rubric and the intercultural competency knowledge rubric and look for anything to add or change. Next week the committee will start out looking at how these two different levels might look like. People should feel free to write out their thoughts.

Consent agenda proposals will be send via email to the committee as well.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski