

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
REVISED MEETING MINUTES  
March 20, 2013  
Olin 304**

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

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

**Guests Present:** Mary Koski, Christina Myatt

1. The committee welcomed visitor, Christina Myatt a secretary in the Theatre Department, who will be taking minutes for the General Education Committee beginning Fall term 2013-2014.

2. **Consent Agenda**

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

1. LSFY 102: The Trojan War from Homer to Hollywood [Day]
2. D for WGST 200: Introduction to LGBTQ Studies [Bertram]
3. PP for SCAN 351: Swedish Immigration to the U.S. [Horrell]

3. **PA FOR ENCW 202: Writing Fiction [Daniels]**

**Motion-Pfautz, Second-Gillette**

**“To approve a PA learning perspective for ENCW 202: Writing Fiction [Daniels].”**

Discussion: This course was taken off the consent agenda for discussion. It was felt question #4 should be more intentional, that the course enable students to explore the relationship between human experience and artistic inspiration. Kelly could make that objective more explicit in his syllabus and for his class objectives, which seem technique and response focused. It was felt that Kelly would be amenable to articulate this further into the creative aspect by making minor revisions. It was brought up, however, that Kelly submitted three proposals for learning perspectives (two were approved 3-13-13) all three identical in language, and this committee expressed no comments recommending that the other two be revised. For consistency, the motion was approved.

**MOTION CARRIED**

**PP FOR ENGL 2XX: Shakespeare and Film [Crowe]**

**Motion-Hough, Second-Gillette**

**“To approve a PP learning perspective for ENGL 2XX: Shakespeare and Film [Crowe].”**

Discussion: The proposal is unclear in determining whether the course really does what a PP ought to do. It seems possible that the students will learn historical facts in order to understand the plays and that the majority of the energy is spent on the text as literature instead of making and supporting claims about history and changes through time. The distinction is between analyzing the historical claims/arguments. Using historical information for context is quite enough for a PP. For contrast, the course used to have a PH; the questions Crowe mentions about the play are more consistent with a PH.

The take-home exam questions, especially, seemed more PH than PP. What would make the proposal more persuasive is if its assignments took the new historicist approach that the class says it adopts (perhaps a research paper where students research some aspect of early modern England and analyze how the play reflects or challenges some of the issues of the day?) Question 4 on the PP proposal asks that the class provide

"opportunities for recursive and/or cumulative written work or formal presentations that afford students the chance to develop and improve a disciplined perspective on the past," but there is no evidence of that on the syllabus. It was suggested that Crowe provide clarification about how the *assignments* (and not just the readings) will develop students' ability to think historically about literature.

**Motion-Katz, Second-Pfautz**

**"To revise the original motion to read:**

**To invite Dave Crowe to resubmit the learning perspective proposal for ENGL 2XX: Shakespeare and Film as a PH –OR- to resubmit PP proposal to include more writing assignments showing how the course will develop the students' ability to think historically about literature."**

**REVISED MOTION CARRIED**

**Q FOR ECON 365: Chinese Economy [Zhou]**

**Motion-Hough, Second-Katz**

**"To approve a Q suffix for ECON 365: Chinese Economy [Zhou]."**

Discussion: A concern was raised that this course may be pitched too high for its (East Asia term) audience. That is, in order to qualify for the Q at the 300-level, is too much being expected of students who may have no Econ background and/or limited quantitative skills; perhaps some of the course assignments/activities are geared a bit high? Students will "need to find historical stock index values for Shanghai, Shenzhen stock exchanges and the S&P 500, calculate the returns, run regressions and find the correlation between these stock markets." They will also be reading Econ journal articles and "could write response papers to them questioning either the arguments or the research method or the data used." There is not much about learning the tools of quantitative analysis. Lina should be asked how students will be taught the quantitative skills that will allow them to do these kinds of assignments. When asked to evaluate whether or not the proposal meets the Q suffix criteria, Brian Katz replied that it clearly does. In that case, the committee felt that it warrants approval.

**MOTION CARRIED**

#### **4. GLOBAL RUBRIC DRAFT**

The current model Gen Ed is discussing is a two-tier approach for intercultural competencies that is not through the G and D lens, but through different levels of expectations and skills. John Pfautz had presented a rubric last week (3-13-13), which Carrie Hough built on by merging John's incorporation of the four specific components of the Intended Learning Outcome description with a two-tiered approach (draft 3-19-13). John wrote a response to that in which he mentions that an intercultural competency requirement at the college/university level should have a "hands-on" component. He recommends that Gen Ed support the inclusion of such a requirement but that the actual spelling out of the details be delegated to a committee staffed by representatives from: International and Off-Campus Studies, General Education Committee, Assessment for Improvement Committee, Freistat Center, and Institutional Research.

One member expressed that what is noticeable about the ICC rubric is that it is all "knowledge" and that "skills" and "attitudes" are gone. Carrie responded that it was partially intentional on her part. Understanding where the knowledge comes from is fairly guaranteed in the average three credit course at Augustana. She was hesitant to build that language for a course if it has no experiential component of interacting with people that are different than they are, aside from the people in the class. She felt broader co-curricular language could be built in, but not as a way to restrict what is possible.

Kristin added that Gen Ed should use the student learning outcomes that the college has approved, and to specifically hone in on the intercultural competency requirement. Gen ed is not the only place students will learn anything about intercultural competency. It was then asked if this committee is working on a rubric for

general education and the intercultural competency outcome, or something that could potentially be used by others? Is it in Gen Ed's charge to work on this as a curricular rubric? Kristin suggests the committee prioritize what it wants ICC1 and ICC2 to look like and start sharing those ideas with faculty.

A comment was made about the difficulty involved in differentiating between the two developmental classes. In the rubric, one category says demonstrates partial understanding and another category says demonstrates an adequate understanding. This division is clear when evaluating students' papers, but not in evaluating student learning. This language is straight from AAC&U. The buzz words to use to differentiate are "encounter" and "analyze". The experience the course offers can also be what shifts the course from ICC1 to ICC2.

A member stated their opposition to the developmental model and stated that two courses and one rubric might work better. The courses would not be required to be different.

Should the new model for Gen Ed, aside from LSFY, be oriented around 8 of our 9 intended learning outcomes instead of 6 learning perspectives and 4 suffixes, if what the college wants students fundamentally to take away should be the basis for whatever we do in general education? Categories would be disciplinary knowledge, critical thinking, information literacy, quantitative literacy, collaborative leadership, intercultural competency, communication competency, creative thinking, ethical citizenship, intellectual curiosity.

Does a hybrid model where the number of learning perspectives is reduced (from 9 to 6), and a new learning perspective category is added (ICC) accomplish Gen Ed's goals?

It was suggested that this committee write all possibilities on the board and then discuss each one and stick to that agenda.

How does the committee feel about one of the courses needing to have an experiential component.

- Worry about making it happen logistically
- Experiential might not be as pure hands on as is desired, but students could still experience things
- Should include options
- Think of alternative experiences; Campus Ministries events; fraternity/sorority events
- Service learning
- Make the experiential just a box to be checked...no credit

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski