

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
March 27, 2013
Olin 302**

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

Members Present: Stefanie Bluemle, Lendol Calder, Mike Egan, Janene Finley, Meg Gillette, Jessica Hilbert, Carrie Hough, Rick Jaeschke, Brian Katz, John Pfautz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson

Guests Present: Mary Koski

1. Approval of Minutes

Motion-Egan, Second-Jaeschke

“To approve the minutes of the March 13, 2013 General Education Committee meeting.”

2. Discussion of Intercultural Competencies Rubric

Rowen Schussheim-Anderson reported that she and three additional Gen Ed members met on 3/25/13 to discuss the draft Intercultural Competency rubric. discussion focused on ICC1 course objectives and what the course would emphasize, versus the course focus for ICC 2. Following is a draft of that conversation:

Draft Mar. 27, 2013

Augustana College’s Intercultural Competency Intended Learning Outcome:

Our graduates should be able to demonstrate a nuanced awareness of difference across multiple domains, a sensitivity to the implications of those differences, a comfort in employing diverse perspectives to understand issues and interact with others, and a relativistic appreciation of cultural values.

Two-Course Intercultural Competency Gen. Ed. Description:

INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCY 1: Multi-Cultural Diversity – Examine and Explore

The courses meeting this requirement would focus on developing the skills necessary for students to engage in intercultural interactions. Students should be encouraged to engage in self-evaluation focused on personal values, followed by exercises designed to broaden their understandings and respect for cultures and people who have other sets of values and biases. Students will develop an appreciation for contemporary, diverse cultural underpinnings through course- related lectures, readings, discussions and media that serve to introduce and expose them to at least one other culture/people group. 3 credits

INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCY 2: Intercultural Communication - Explore and Encounter

The second of these courses continues with the skills learned in the first, but includes application of these skills with interpersonal exchanges with people from a culture group different from the student’s own. A minimum of 25% of this courses seat time is devoted to experiential encounters during which students are observing and investigating the complexities of cultural difference through intellectual and emotional filters. The faculty for these courses will

be helpful in setting up these opportunities for intercultural encounters and may take the form of interviews, service-learning projects, arts-related collaborations, and others. 3 credits
 Any form of study abroad experience may apply to satisfy the ICC 2 requirement. The application would ask for specific, course-related exercises/ assignments that are focused on applying intercultural skills learned in ICC 1, further promoting the intellectual and emotional understandings difference in people and cultures.

Learning Outcome Dimensions	Intercultural Competency I Multi-cultural diversity (Examine and Explore) Learn how to look at culture without your own cultural biases (not necessarily studying contemporary peoples/culture group)	Intercultural Competency II Intercultural Communication (Explore and Encounter) (Predominantly study contemporary people/culture group)
Awareness of Difference Across Multiple Domains (Self-oriented?)	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g., with a preference for those rules shared with own cultural group).	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g., not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer). Analyzes assumptions
Sensitivity to the Implications of Those Differences (Others-oriented?)	Demonstrates understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture/group in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy or beliefs and practices.	Participates in direct interaction/experience with people/group different from oneself
Using Diverse Perspectives to Understand Issues and Interact with Others	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds with own worldview (in interactions and/or assignments/evaluation opportunities?).	Demonstrates an awareness of intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions in hands-on project or research
Relativistic Appreciation of Cultural Values	Discusses the advantages of understanding viewpoints different from his/her own (as a means to better navigate our diverse world?).	Applies multiple perspectives to (local or global) issues (relevant to the course/experience?). Demonstrates understanding of and/or comparative analysis of role of interconnected global community

[End of 3/25/13 meeting minutes draft]

Prior to today's meeting, comments were emailed in, indicating there may be two resistance points to the ICC1 and ICC2 model that will be presented at the upcoming Friday Conversation. The first, that this model cuts against the grain of good learning theory. Research shows that students understand and remember not what they hear, but what they think about and *do*; conversely, information not used is lost. Thus, a developmental model like ICC 1 and 2 will flounder because the knowledge gained in ICC1 will evaporate in the time interval between ICC 1 and 2. The difficulty for students will be finding the right course when they need it, and some won't. The difficulty for the Gen Ed committee will be judging whether a course is 1 or 2. Consider this: the logic of ICC 1 and 2 would suggest a student should take 1 before 2. Yet many lower-level courses are likely to be categorized as ICC 2 and upper-level courses as ICC 1. Won't this be a problem exacerbating the difficulties mentioned above?

As an alternative, the following was offered:

Alternative 1: Keep a two-tiered model, but require ICC1 to have 25% intercultural encounters or exercises, and ICC2 to have 50% or more. This would take care of the first objection and be consistent with the science of how people learn.

Alternative 2: Go with a six-credit (2-course) requirement, but drop the developmental approach. Return to the AACU outcomes and make them better. This meets the objection to D & G originally voiced, that our current D & G requirement was ICC "lite". It also makes Gen Ed simpler, not more complicated. At the January Gen Ed meeting, Steve Bahls expressed a desire that the Gen Ed program be simpler.

Discussion: Alternative #2 above does not directly address the differences between G and D and does not indicate whether there is a practical, hands on experience or a project.

What might be perceived as "complicating" things in discussing the developmental model is that one course needs to be taken before the second course. The committee was not sure how it would work to have 300 or 400-level courses be designated as ICC1 and 100 and 200-level courses designated as ICC2. What ought to be thought out is how a student goes through a course developmentally and where in the sequence the direct engagement should be which is critical for the development.

Some feel that this developmental approach should occur to provide balance and a purposeful track through general education. The narrative on course proposal approval forms would communicate the ways in which the students are supposed to grow in intercultural competence with awareness and encountering. If it can be mapped onto a very deliberate and demonstrated taxonomy, that is a solid way of moving forward in a developmental way.

Those members involved in the 3-25-13 talk felt that at least ICC2 would need to be about the current, contemporary world because if you are asking students to experience something with people, a culture group, or community event, that is not something you can do and focus on from ancient Greece, for example.

Another thought was that direct engagement could happen in either or both courses, a reciprocal relationship between the two, and be less of a developmental model.

A two-course approach, doing away with the ICC1 and 2 sequential model, could incorporate an "X" suffix (for experiential), and at least one of the courses had to be taken with the "X" suffix. It was suggested that the course could be a combination of D & G. Some felt that this does not help define the faults Gen Ed is having with the D and G.

One committee member expressed that the Gen Ed Committee should take the lead in building assessment into the new program.

Rowen asked if the committee wants to think about not having the two-tier model, rather two different responsibilities for each class. Support for a non-developmental model was expressed if the two courses were to be very different experiences. Also, less enthusiasm was expressed if one of these courses' content was G and D.

The committee attempted to find an outcome word that is the result of "engagement, exploring, examining". Bloom's taxonomy is: remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate and create. The committee should task themselves to study "What is the framing that is happening?" in the courses, like the pre- and the post. The experience is important, doing is important, but "doing" must be given some meaning. "Apply" was offered as the outcome word. The world is the place where knowledge is applied, or we learn from those experiences and apply what was learned to some kind of reflective or summative piece. Or talking about one particular lens and apply that; not apply in a sense of direct encounter, but apply by taking a tool we have and doing something with it, and ask "How are these tools related to each other?"

In discussing the upcoming Friday Conversation format, the committee discussed whether or not to announce that the G and D requirement will be done away with. Several members indicated that although there was consensus among the committee to do away with G and D, that the Gen Ed Committee did not formally vote on doing away with G and D. This led some to believe that faculty present at the Friday Conversation would take the opportunity to preserve the G and D requirement. A motion was made:

Motion-Jaeschke, Second-Hough

"The General Education Committee charges itself with designing a program of approximately six credits that replaces the G and D with experiences that are intended to meet the Intercultural Competency college-wide learning objective."

MOTION CARRIED

3. Discussion of upcoming Friday Conversation

For the upcoming Friday Conversation on General Education, the format that was proposed is "Steps Toward Realizing one of our Learning Outcomes". A handout will be prepared with approximately five bullet points, each with a paragraph describing each model the committee is currently considering (ICC 1 and 2, developmental model, experiential component, two-course model). One Gen Ed member per table will help facilitate the conversation.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski
Office of Academic Programs