

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**March 6, 2013**  
**Olin 304**

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

**Members Present:** Stefanie Bluemle, Joe Bright, Lendol Calder, Patrick Crawford, Kristin Douglas, Mike Egan, Janene Finley, Carrie Hough, Rick Jaeschke, Virginia Johnson, Brian Katz, John Pfautz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson

**Guests Present:** Mary Koski

1. John Pfautz was welcomed back.
2. **Friday Conversation** – The General Education Committee is hosting a Friday Conversation on April 5, 2013. All committee members were encouraged to attend and be prepared to bring forth ideas. Possible Friday Conversation titles:
  - General Education Conversation about the G and D
  - The Future of G and D
  - Intercultural Competency
3. **Gen Ed Meetings** – Gen Ed will be cancelled on April 10<sup>th</sup> due to a Senate Faculty meeting, and on May 1<sup>st</sup> due to the college-wide retirement reception. Mary Koski to find a two-hour time slot for a special Gen Ed meeting to make up for those two cancellations. Virginia suggested that for May 1<sup>st</sup> Gen Ed members could attend just a portion of the reception if another solution is not found.
4. **Minutes**  
**Motion-Jaeschke, Second-Johnson**  
**“To approve the minutes of the January 23 and 30, 2013 General Education Committee meetings.”**

Mike Egan asked that the January 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting minutes be changed on page 2. Replace the name: “Paul Croll” with the words: “A member”.

**MOTION CARRIED**

5. **2013-2014 Gen Ed Committee Chair**

Carrie Hough was selected as the Gen Ed Committee chair for 2013-2014.

6. **Discussion of G and D**

For now, the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric is guiding the discussion for coming up with a new definition for Augustana’s intercultural competency requirement; however, it is too involved to use as a talking point for the upcoming Friday Conversation. From the matrix and the Intercultural Competence definition (from Student Learning Outcomes document), the committee discussed how to incorporate Intercultural Competence in the gen ed requirements. The committee discussed options for transitioning from what now reads as G and D to a new requirement. After breaking out into groups at the March 6<sup>th</sup> Gen Ed meeting the committee suggested that the new requirement may still have two parts to it, but they might not be exactly diversity and global, and would

perhaps be more like an introductory level (encountering) and a higher level (analyzing) course. They talked about the possibility of the introductory, or encounter, course being in one of the LSFY classes. Also suggested was: 1) the idea that experiential learning or service learning where people are involved with real situations somewhere in this matrix; and 2) that G and D best fulfilled intercultural competency on the Student Learning Outcomes, and that whatever the new outcome is, it should speak to this.

Since the matrix is so detailed, the committee will choose fewer components of it to work with. Augustana's intended learning outcome of Intercultural Competence reads: "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." Should these things be equated to a row in the rubric? One way to approach working with the rubric is to use the preponderance approach.

Could/should Gen Ed give a directive that at least the first level become a component of LSFY? The theme of LSFY 103 is to prepare students for a diverse and changing world. If this was done, it was suggested that a very large and holistic examination of LSFY be undertaken, as LSFY faculty already feel too many requirements are expected to be touched upon, resulting in teachers just picking and choosing the ones that they feel they can actually accomplish. There is a lot of stuff to do in 10 weeks. However, including this in LSFY gives our students something that can be valued from early on in their career here.

Some faculty may feel more comfortable teaching encountering intercultural competency versus a more analytical or second-phase course. So would that necessarily shoehorn all of the current G and D courses into that second tier where faculty might feel like they are not ready to do that kind of work? The developmental part is essential, having students doing one before the other. Maybe one is a 100 or 200 level course, the other a 300 or 400 level course. Concern was expressed that shifting this to LSFY 103 has the potential to leave out those faculty currently teaching G and D courses who would not want to teach at that 300 or 400 level.

Rowen asked if the committee decided to do away with separating G and D into American issues and non-American issues. Based on the way the rubric is written, the G and D may have to be done away with.

LSFY 103 can be thought of as before encountering, "awareness encountering or analyzing", and anyone who is teaching 103, therefore, needs to be on board with awareness.

Instead of putting all this on 103, a very small component or some concepts could be added to the rubric. Or perhaps it could be a 200 level course, a second-year course. If this was done, oral presentation could move to that 200-level course that everyone would take (sophomore or junior year), which would remove the burden from LSFY. Roanoke College has ICC courses and different courses can get that ICC designation. If Augustana goes with a two-tier system we would need two designations like ICC1 and ICC2, but it would still be expected for students to take their Christian Traditions course. A comment was made that Augustana faculty and advisor do not do a good job of telling our students why they take Christian Traditions after LSFY 101.

This discussion certainly fits into Gen Ed's larger discussion about advising and how that fits into the whole general education experience and into assessment. The conversation also overlaps with the matrix conversation.

The developmental argument has logic to it because as individuals we move developmentally. But not every 18-year-old coming to Augustana is at level one. If we have the step system, there will be students

that should not be there and vice versa. This makes the choice idea powerful. Let students sort out whether they want to take the lower level or the upper level according to their schedule and needs.

A third component that has been discussed as part of the G and D replacement might be a hands-on experience, an immersion of some sort. LSFY would cover the rubric categories of "Knowledge". The "Skills" categories could be reworded or adopted into some sort of practical experience that is associated with hands on. (Hands-on, ≠ a competency or outcome; however, so a new word is needed) Analysis would then be the third course. Other colleges do this kind of thing. A unique example of an intercultural experience is a course where students spend four weekends in Boston with 60 hours of seat time. In those four weeks students live in hostels, off campus, together in a community and they are working within the community. It is a hands-on practical experience as well as traditional seat time, and would still work in a sequential experience. Augustana would have to consider the practicality of this kind of experience. However, the service learning or contact with people who are different could happen through student activities, residential life, Greek Life. These areas would be excellent constituencies on campus to reach out to, especially since it is extremely difficult to offer that many experiences attached to classes, and are ways that could be tied to student learning outcomes.

Kristin brought up to think about as we look at our students' experiences in the first year, the second year, and lumping junior and senior year together, that we do not as a college articulate exactly what we want students to have accomplished after their first year. We ask them to take LSFY and a foreign language, but we do not say "These are the things students should be able to do after their first year at Augustana College." We do not talk about how their extra co-curricular activities are building into their academic experience. We do not have that kind of language on campus right now, but it needs to be built. One group of students that is left out in the cold many times are sophomores, particularly those undeclared. So building the sophomore experience by telling students that they will take their first ICC class sophomore year as well as their Christian Traditions class sophomore year, and inform them what they will get out of Christian Traditions. Then tell them that their junior and senior year is more their major. A 200-level course at the sophomore level might help.

The COMPASS program was discussed. Kristin indicated it is in its infancy, and good guidelines for sophomore, junior and seniors are not yet developed. Sophomore guidelines need to get in place for next year because the first-year tools are currently being used. In our holistic, residential college, COMPASS ideally would include the CEC, residential life, student activities, and advising.

The committee may need to look at what courses now carry G or D to see if there are courses that would satisfy ICC1 and ICC2 and to identify which ones would be at the 100/ 200 and 300/400 levels.

The students should be told that in order for them to get this ICC 300 level course they would have to take a ICC 100 level course. Or for developmentally advanced students, the option of taking at least one 300 level course, but a minimum of two ICC courses could exist. That way they could take two upper level courses.

To summarize where we are (much taken from the words of Carrie Hough):

To better associate the goals of Augustana's general education curriculum with our recently-approved student learning outcomes, it has become clear that it is time to revisit the D and G suffixes. This committee is investigating initial ideas about the ways we might rethink our approach to these suffixes to ensure that the students experience courses that approach diversity and difference in a rigorous and challenging way. Enforcing the boundaries of G and D also was becoming unweildly.

The “Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric” has been introduced as a way for this committee to seek a developmental model for students to move from initial encounters with and appreciation of diversity/difference to a more complex set of knowledge, attitudes and skills.

An option to replace G and D is to create a developmental two-course sequence that would challenge students to move from “benchmark” to “milestone” outcomes. To also consider is requiring an experiential component like an extended community-engagement project, a service-learning course or an off-campus study experience designed to be immersive.

Committee will use the VALUE rubric to figure out the criteria for ICC1 and ICC2

The committee will work on this at its March 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. Learning Perspective and Suffix approval forms will now be put on a consent agenda. The proposals will be forwarded to the committee and if anyone would like the proposal to be discussed with the whole committee, please ask Rowen to remove it from the consent agenda; otherwise they will be considered passed.

7. The meeting adjourned at 5:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski