

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
May 8, 2013
Olin 304

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

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

Guests Present: Mary Koski

1. Topics for Next Fall

Chair, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson discussed topics that might be brought up for discussion in the fall: 1) Learning Communities and the integrative learning idea that might turn into something different (interdisciplinary?), perhaps service learning, ICC; and 2) making a less complicated transition for two-year transfers with Associate's degrees coming into Augustana as it relates to general education requirements; 3) inviting Mark Salisbury to discuss intercultural competency and how the learning outcomes are connected to or are integral to general education; inviting Assessment for Improvement Committee members to help Gen Ed evaluate what is distinctive and what is unique about our program and how to strengthen or modify it; and continue looking at LSFY.

2. ICC DISCUSSION

The goal of the discussion was to:

1. decide if ICC is going to take the form of an LP
2. decide if ICC is going to consist of two courses
3. decide if ICC is going to consist of two courses, will the courses be developmental?
4. discuss the experiential component of ICC
5. discuss Kristen's mapping of the SLO's onto our previous mapping from winter term

Comments

- Regarding whether or not ICC should be in the form of an LP, it was felt that a decision cannot be made unless a decision to modify the 6+3 has been made.
- Could we do away with suffixes and have learning perspectives? Does "Q" (which is still needed) become a learning perspective, a "PQ"?
- Should learning perspectives be looked through disciplinary lenses?
- When the learning perspectives were designed they were not designed as a disciplinary lens. They are ways of knowing, ways of investigating, but not intended to be owned by one discipline. However, disciplines such as math, are not represented by either the LP or the Q
- ICC in Draft 8 qualifies as a disposition, but the Gen Ed committee's discussions on ICC moves it toward something more than a disposition. Does the committee need to comply with Draft 8? Does the committee need permission to modify it?
- Instead of calling them "learning perspectives" and "suffixes", they could be called KSDs (knowledge, skills and dispositions, which becomes a list. As people talk to students about these things, indicate how "these" fit into skills; "these" fit into dispositions, etc., but eliminate the learning perspective title.
- Think of the learning perspectives as stand-alone designations which do not exist in conjunction with other designations (so a "Q" cannot be a PN or PH, just as ICC cannot be a PS, or PH, etc.)

- Distinction between what we call learning perspectives and suffixes now can be maintained (these disciplinary versus ability concepts), but indicate that courses may only have one designation.
- We as a college have not been very specific with students identifying how they should be considering these different learning perspectives and identifying what is different between the different perspectives.
- We could move towards an idea of showing competency. For example by the portfolio method.
- If it is a skill or way of knowing, can the two-course idea exist? Many of those two courses were being double-dipped.

Another ICC option could be to incorporate some of the lower-level skills into an LSFY class so that all students get those in their first year. Then whatever course has the ICC designation is the higher-level skill. This may be problematic, but less so than requiring two ICCs and having a model where all the other learning perspectives were down to 6 instead of 9. Now that the LSFY Skills Matrix is pared down, LSFY faculty have the time to incorporate a “diverse and changing world” more intentionally where in the past they did less so. The common element could be this idea that you look at something from a diverse perspective, as opposed to a common element being a physical thing that everyone uses.

It is a strong idea to introduce students to multicultural/intercultural ideas as soon as they arrive on campus, as it develops and interest for study abroad and widens their global perspective. Two ways this can be done is to make LSFY 103 a 4-credit course instead of a 3-credit course (adding more seat time so that one credit has to do with the ICC emphasis). The other possibility is to have 3-credit gateway courses, such as Introduction to Africana Studies or Asian Studies (and adding a few more), that are designed with that in mind, and also require a fourth first-year course. Concern was expressed that students may not have the flexibility in their schedules for this option. Would this option preclude the developmental approach from the first course to the second, so that the second course is designed independently? Is the second course built upon what was taught in LSFY 103 to a deeper understanding later? It was felt that LSFY 103 could become a more robust and authentic ICC experience.

Another option could be a 1 or 2-credit first or second-year requirement for students to get their feet wet with global awareness, such as a required seminar.

Concern was expressed that the fewer choices students have, the more negative they are. Should we worry that if we are too specific about how the ICC requirement has to happen that would undermine our ability to successfully have them develop those skills? Referring to it as a common experience that everyone has might help to avoid this.

If ICC does get incorporated into LSFY 103, faculty development ought to be provided so that faculty can be taught authentically. The Gen Ed group can very easily sit down with faculty and convince them that they are quite capable of teaching ICC in a diverse and changing world.

We are moving from a model where we were not demonstrating what students get out of the courses that we intended them to (and a lot of those courses with those designations were not moving students in those directions), to a model where we can be very directive and very intentional about what outcomes we want to produce.

Whether or not study abroad would still satisfy ICC requirements was debated. Study abroad would likely need to apply for the ICC designation every time and would not be given automatic ICC designation.

It was suggested to ask to see Pastor Priggie’s LSFY course syllabus to see if ICC is being done, even if by accident. Gen Ed committee should provide a model syllabus for people to review, which is one way for them to review a sample syllabus so they come to the realization that they could and would enjoy teaching a course like this.

A motion was made:

Motion-Jaeschke, Second-Hough

“That Gen Ed Committee use LSFY 103 as a way to incorporate some of the basic skills, understandings, and dispositions of ICC and have a second course that is called ICC.”

MOTION CARRIED (abstain-2)

3. New Business

Meg Gillette asked if the committee would object if over the summer she clarified and revised some of the questions on the LSFY Approval Form to make them more specific, and bring a draft back to the committee in the fall. Committee members gave their support for this work. It was suggested that a common elements checklist might be included in the revised form so that instructors can ensure all these things are included in their syllabus. It was suggested that the form asks for an explanation of how the course is well suited for an 18-year-old audience, and also a place for the instructor to provide details about the overall course content.

4. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski
Office of Academic Affairs