

Spring 3-30-2016

Minutes, March 30, 2016

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/gened>

Recommended Citation

"Minutes, March 30, 2016" (2016). *General Education Committee*.
<http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/gened/21>

This Governance is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at Augustana Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in General Education Committee by an authorized administrator of Augustana Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@augustana.edu.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 30, 2016

4:00-5:00

Olin 304

AGENDA

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

Present: Kaylynn Burke(SGA), Mike Egan, Imran Farooqi, Nathan Frank, Brian Katz, Mamata Marme, Kelvin Mason, Jeff Ratliff-Crain(ExOfficio), Lisa Seidlitz, Rachel Weiss

Absent: Lendol Calder, Rob Elflin*, Sarah McDowell, Cole Neder (SGA)*, Jamie Nordling

*Unable to attend this term.

I. MINUTES

Approval of March 23, 2016 meeting minutes (1 file)

Motion to approve the Minutes as submitted: Frank; Second: Mason

Motion Passed

II. CONTINUING and NEW BUSINESS

1. Tabled Course Approvals

a. LCs

i. LC2-HumanLife (4 files) no update yet

b. LP/Suffix

i. FREN-357 PS (2 files) no update yet

Motion to retable both of these motions: Katz; Second: Seidlitz

Motion Passed

2. Continue working on the vision and assessment plan for the core curriculum

a. See the VisionStructureMappingNotes for a typed version of the comments from large Post-It pads.

b. Attempting to revise the course proposal forms to be in line with the vision and practice of the committee.

Members of the committee broke into groups and attempted to draft new course proposal forms that address the themes of this year's discussion: (1) identify ~3 SLOs for each designation and ask about them in the form, (2) connect to our drafted Vision for the Core Curriculum, (3) focus on ways of knowing instead of content, possibly using the SignatureQuestion work, (4) focus on student learning in the course rather than faculty input into the syllabus, and (5) possibly embed GenEd assessment in the form.

Groups considered the PL, PN, and FYI designations. Themes:

- We expect to ask how students will grow with respect to each SLO, not about whether they will reach a common threshold.
- In addition to asking how students will grow wrt an SLO, we want to know how students will demonstrate that growth (or how faculty will assess that growth).
- Focusing on only the SLOs does not seem to be sufficient to define the LPs. Can we distill the current form into a question to address the meta-disciplinary lens? Can some of the current form language become advisory on a new form?
- Should there be flexibility in selecting the objectives for the instructor? Such flexibility could be a problem for assessment, though we certainly agree that instructors have objectives outside of those they discuss in the GenEd proposals.
- We would like to ask how the course connects to the rest of the curriculum and how the course helps students make those connections.
- We may need to give space for the instructor to describe the big picture of the course in order to interpret the responses to these other questions more efficiently.
- While designations might be paired with an SLO, we do not intend the instructor to address all aspects of the SLO. In fact, we may intend them to focus on a specific sub-component.
- The LP and FYI components may have common objectives in this framework, helping to be intentional about their connections. The FYI group suggested that FYI-101 have two objectives and that the subsequent courses each add another objective.

Each group will draft a new form based on their work. The committee will discuss these drafts next week.

3. Updates from Academic Affairs

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS and DISCUSSION

1. GenEd snacks!

The members of the committee thank Kelvin Mason for supplying a snack.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.