

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 16, 2009  
Olin 304**

**Members Present:** Kristin Douglas, Anne Earel, Randall Hall, Allison Haskill, Dan Lee, Joe McDowell, Mariano Magalhaes, Lisa Seidlitz, Karin Youngberg, Margaret Farrar, Josh Morgan, and Fred Whiteside; **Members Absent:** Allen Bertsche (foreign term); Emil Kramer (no replacement yet)

The meeting came to order at 5:03 PM.

**AGENDA ITEM I – APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion- “To approve the General Education Committee meeting minutes of September 9, 2009.” APPROVED**

**AGENDA ITEM II – OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Learning communities survey**

Dan questioned whether we need to use a survey at this point. He suggested that our colleagues provided LC feedback at the retreat.

Anne suggested that the survey focus on the issue of whether instructors are willing/able to participate in the program. Margaret suggested that perhaps a two part question would help us, something to the effect of, are you available/willing to participate in our current LC model? and would you be able to participate with a new, more flexible model?

Fred inquired whether the formerly used first year sequential learning courses (e.g., cohort classes that focus on a common theme, such as environmental issues) would satisfy our IL needs. Margaret said that there are no formal means for this at the moment, but perhaps may be a consideration for a future pilot program.

Because several additional LCs are needed for next year, it was suggested that an abbreviated survey be distributed. Perhaps the AACU rubric for integrative learning may be consulted for ideas on language to use for our survey. It specifically was recommended to replace question 6 in the working draft with possible elements of LC. This way, the survey would address principles over specifics of what our campus hopes to achieve from LCs. Perhaps the specifics could more aptly be addressed in a proposal draft.

There was some discussion about possible future steps for discussing the LC/IL issues with faculty. Dan suggested that it may work for gen ed representatives to lead discussions at upcoming division meetings. Concerns were raised over attendance, the tendency of non-tenured faculty to speak in such forums, and inconsistent groupings of divisions. There was a strong sentiment that the conversation needs to be advanced because calendars are prepared in winter.

The committee’s homework for next week is to consider alternative models, including Randall’s document, the current Evergreen draft, and bring feedback for discussion at our next meeting.

**B. Integrated learning definitions**

With regard to what peer and aspirant institutions are doing to address integrated learning, four schools that included IL components in their programs were reviewed. Overall, common themes emerged in this review of peer institutions with LC-esque requirements: 1) team taught courses; 2) interdisciplinary “clusters” that are similar to our LCs; 3) LCs offered across two different terms; and 4) interdisciplinary minors. Many of these elements are covered in our current Evergreen document and may be expanded in an updated Evergreen document. Dennison includes a global perspectives course in which world issues are addressed in an interdisciplinary approach. Gettysburg includes two courses from interdisciplinary clusters, similar to our present LC format, however the courses are taken specifically in the sophomore year. Luther requires “interdisciplinary understanding and individual synthesis” in their IL courses. St. Olaf requires an interdisciplinary course in ethical issues.

### **C. G clarification**

Generally, there was strong committee support for the recent clarifications, and it was predicted that only minor exceptions may arise.

## **AGENDA ITEM III – NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. LSFY 100 course approval.**

**Motion-** Whiteside, **Second-** Youngberg **APPROVED**  
**“To approve the 2 credit LSFY 100 course proposal”**

Discussion over whether the workload is reflective of a 2 credit course, and the committee generally expressed that there were no concerns (there was a strong multi draft writing component) and the course was designed to have similar elements as other 2 credit courses currently being offered to meet the same needs for the same group of students as the proposed course.

### **B. Student proposal to transfer LC from DePaul University**

The committee recommended that this proposal not be accepted, that the distance learning DePaul course, though it may have involved content related to group learning dynamics, did not meet Augustana’s criteria for LCs. Further, the committee thought that the College’s policy on graduation requirements were made clear on numerous occasions over the past two years. Margaret requested additional details from the DePaul instructor, but did not receive them at the time of consideration.

### **C. Update from Academic Affairs**

Margaret presented the College’s new community college transfer agreement and explained that its purpose was to facilitate flexibility for incoming CC transfer students. Though the document specifically applies to several specific CCs, transferring students with AA degrees from other CCs will receive individual advising from the registrar in collaboration with specific departments, as has been the approach taken in the past.

**The meeting adjourned at 6:01 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,

Ali Haskill