

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
October 28, 2009
Olin 304**

Members Present: Kristin Douglas, Josh Morgan, Ashley Booth, Tom Bengtson, Anne Earel, Randall Hall, Allison Haskill, Dan Lee, Joe McDowell, Lisa Seidlitz, Margaret Farrar, Virginia Johnson, and Fred Whiteside; **Members Absent:** Allen Bertsche (foreign term), Karin Youngberg

The meeting came to order at 5:01 PM.

AGENDA ITEM I – APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion- Josh Morgan, **Second-** Joe McDowell **APPROVED**
“To approve the General Education Committee meeting minutes of October 21, 2009.”

AGENDA ITEM II – OLD BUSINESS

A. Evergreen II Discussion

The committee heard a review of feedback from Friday’s conversation and emails to Kristin regarding the proposal draft:

John Hurty expressed concern about labeling the Choir option “co-curricular option” because it is actually a part of the regular curriculum. It also was suggested that students pursuing this IL option should be involved in the activity for an entire year, which would result in additional credit.

New model suggestion: Students wouldn’t necessarily take 2 separate LC courses, but instead take a 1 credit course to pair 2 courses that are unrelated (non LC courses that may be thematically similar).

Margaret: We may not be able to list all possible options in Evergreen II, but we do have the clause in our proposal that indicates we will consider pilot programs. This clause may help when new options such as the one described above are presented by faculty. If faculty want to continue the discussion after tomorrow’s forum, perhaps gen ed members and Margaret could meet Monday of finals week.

Kristin: We need to have the final proposal to EPC by next Wednesday, Nov. 4, and we should consider this deadline as we proceed in our discussions.

Dan and Joe: Do we need to address this revision through EPC and Senate or does this matter need to go before the full faculty?

Kristin’s response: Senate’s parliamentarian said that the revised proposal does not need to go directly to the faculty as a whole because it is a revision of an existing policy.

Joe: Friday conversations went well. Faculty was generally accepting, there were constructive comments, but very little negative reaction.

Dan also heard primarily positive comments, and others have told him that they also believed the discussion was positive.

B. Motion- Fred Whiteside, **Second-** Joe McDowell **APPROVED**
“To reconsider the “D” suffix vote for Keessen’s WLIT course.”

Discussion:

Kristin: When we voted two weeks ago, many voted on the WLIT designation and not the “D” suffix, which was the real objective of the approval.

C. Motion- Fred Whiteside, **Second-** Josh Morgan **TABLED**
“ To approve a “D” suffix for Keessen’s WLIT course”

Discussion:

A comment was made that it is not problematic that a film course has a WLIT dept code. There is precedent for such a designation.

Another comment addressed the question: Is there evidence of how diversity will be addressed in the course? Though the selected films may address diversity, it is unclear how diversity will be addressed in the course. Diversity may not be fully integrated into the course proposal; diversity seems like an afterthought, and there seems to be a breakdown between diversity and the course title which deals with other aspects of film

Regarding film choices, it was noted that “Crash,” included in the list of films to be shown in the course, was used with some success in addressing diversity in LSFY 103 for 2 years. Other movies may be questionable (e.g., Fargo).

Kristin asked what kinds of things would we want to see in a revised proposal if we ask Dr. Keessen for a resubmission?

After reviewing the “D” suffix requirements it was suggested that we ask Dr. Keessen to address questions 2 and 3 more thoroughly.

A further comment was made regarding how diversity would be addressed cohesively through the assignments, considering the multiple aspects of disability that appear to be addressed in the varied films listed. Concerns about the course might be addressed with a syllabus revision.

Kristin: Dr. Keessen realizes that the course has not made it through the governance process in a timely manner this term to receive credit for a D in the winter term, but there may be time for it to be listed as a “D” course for spring when it is offered again.

It was asked whether it would be fair for spring term but not winter term students to receive a “D” and for the same course?

Kristin's response: This would be an issue for the registrar to address.

AGENDA ITEM III: NEW BUSINESS

A. Suffix Approvals

1. **Motion-** Virginia Johnson, **Second-** Fred Whiteside **APPROVED**
“To approve a “D” suffix for HIST 373 African-American History (Calder)”
2. **Motion-** Joe McDowell, **Second-** Alli Haskill **APPROVED**
“To approve a “G” suffix for HIST 348 Colonialism and Imperialism (Cleveland)”
3. **Motion-** Fred Whiteside, **Second-** Joe McDowell **APPROVED**
“To approve a “G” suffix for RELG 371 Faiths in Dialogue (Lee)”

Discussion:

A comment was made that, technically, other similar courses (e.g., Ireland term courses) could meet our current G criteria, but may not necessarily be what we really have in mind for being outside the dominant influence of the US. Dr. Lee shared this sentiment, however, after speaking with participating students, thought it would be a good idea to submit the course for “G” approval.

Another member commented that it would be a disservice to students to give “G” credit for a course that isn't truly global.

To address the course content, it was noted that there is a strong Catholic tradition in the US, but the course focus is not limited solely to US traditions. Are there just 2 dialogues covered in the course? Will that limit the content?

One member summarized the discussion by stating that the way our “G” suffix document is written, this course meets the “G” requirements.

B. Update from Academic Affairs

Margaret and Bob Haak recently attended an assessment workshop. One idea that emerged was to consider merging gen ed and senior inquiry assessment processes (i.e., assess senior inquiry papers by using the gen ed skills matrices).

Kristin attended a recent curriculum task force meeting. We may want to revisit some of our ideas brainstormed in the summer about our ideas for streamlining the LSFY program. Such a move would likely fit well with a reduction that ultimately may be recommended by the curriculum task force.

AGENDA ITEM IV: ANNOUNCEMENTS

Faculty forum: October 29th at 11:30 AM in the Olin Auditorium.

Our next meeting will be Wednesday of week 1 of winter term and there will be no meeting week 2 because of the Thanksgiving recess.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Alli Haskill