

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
December 7, 2011  
Evald 305**

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 PM.

**Members Present:** Anne Earel, Mike Egan, Carrie Hough, Rick Jaeschke, Brian Katz, Jason Koontz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson, Patrick Howell, Tom Bengtson, Lendol Calder, Alli Haskill, Emil Kramer, Margaret Farrar

**Approval of Minutes**

**Motion**-Jason Koontz, **Second**-Anne Earel

**“To approve the minutes of the November 30, 2011 General Education Committee meetings.”**

Discussion: Carrie H. pointed out that she did not record who made motions for our final item on last week’s agenda. We agreed that Emil K. made the motion, and Jason K. seconded.

**MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE MINUTES FOR 11-30-11 AS REVISED**

**Decisions of the Governance Prep Group**

Rowen S-A indicated that Donna Hare’s LSFY 103 course was approved for this coming spring on a one-time basis by the GPG. Donna Hare will still need to go through the full governance process before this course will be granted permanent status.

Rowen shared that Dan Lee’s proposed service-learning LC could not become an LC according to Liesl Fowler since it involved a “399” entity that cannot count as a service-learning experience or as a complete course within an LC. Rowen S-A indicated that Dan would be advised to build a new course with a different course number, shepherd it through governance, etc.

**Discussion of Rationales for Adjustments to Gen Ed Requirements**

Margaret F. asked for input related to the rationale for the proposed Integrated Learning (IL) requirement. She pointed out that it is very difficult to write a clean definition for the intended meaning for the “interdisciplinary major” model for IL, because if language specifies “counting” courses from departments or divisions, then several majors/programs that the Committee does not really consider as meeting the spirit of the IL would be eligible to become IL programs under this kind of definition; conversely, programs such as Africana Studies that the Committee does consider as meeting the intended spirit, would fall short of meeting a definition that dictates a particular number of departments or divisions.

Jason K. raised the question if the burden of arguing for IL could be placed on the shoulders of the students, that is, having the student submit an application to the committee arguing for why a particular combination of courses could be considered as meeting the IL requirement. We all recognized that this could lead to an inordinate amount of proposals before the Committee, however.

Rowen S-A pointed out that Dean Lawrence is expecting to hear the Committee's decision on this matter soon, and therefore we do need to get something down on paper even if we have not really come up with a proposal that we find completely acceptable. Rowen wondered if we could submit a proposal that includes language acknowledging that further refinement is still needed.

Margaret F. wondered if a solution might involve making an interdisciplinary senior inquiry project count as the IL requirement as opposed to the interdisciplinary major. It was discussed that there seem to be challenges in prompting seniors to build interdisciplinary projects, and some departments are less amendable to accommodating interdisciplinary SI projects than others.

Lendol C. suggested that it seemed unlikely that an adequate number of undergraduates would pursue this model.

We discussed the possibility that majors such as Business, Accounting, Education, or Pre-Med might claim interdisciplinary status. Tom B. raised the question about whether an assumption was being made that many students would avoid LCs, service-learning, international study, etc. because they would be able to take care of the IL requirement through their major. And, further, do we believe that students who react this way would be missing out on a vital component of their general education? We all recognized that we can't know for sure how students would respond, but it does seem that this scenario might be possible.

Lendol suggested that we might consider avoiding thinking about this from an "IL suffix" perspective. He noted that it's likely that the vast majority of our students experience some form of IL from their college years regardless of a formal mandate. Furthermore, just because a student is in an official IL course, doesn't mean that they are truly integrating their learning. He suggested that intentionality in instructional design, whereby instructors actively prompt students to make interdisciplinary connections, is the most important element regardless of the departments, divisions, or suffixes involved. Thus, a model whereby students might be prompted to build a concept map as a way of demonstrating the interdisciplinary thinking they are engaging with (possibly in the context of their Senior Inquiry project) might be a worthwhile approach.

**Motion-Tom B., Second-Emil K.**

**"To remove the IL requirement from the General Education realigned curricular proposals, with the rationale that a critical mass of Augustana students experience IL as part of their collegiate sequence anyway."**

It was pointed out that the LC advocates would attack this. A great deal of discussion surrounded this issue. As noted below, the motion carried, but it was emphasized that the intention is to encourage Integrated Learning, but not mandate it. Gen Ed will encourage departments to take ownership of integrated learning and build models that are appropriate to them.

**Yea = 6**

**Nay = 4**

**Motion Carried**

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 5:02pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike Egan  
Education Department