

8-24-2016

Minutes, August 24, 2016

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

Recommended Citation

"Minutes, August 24, 2016" (2016). *General Education Committee*.
<http://digitalcommons.augustana.edu/gened/30>

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
MEETING MINUTES**

August 24, 2016

Olin 304

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

Members Present: Mike Egan (Chair), Rob Elflin, Ian Harrington, Kelvin Mason, Jeff Ratliff-Crain (XO), Lisa Seidlitz, Christopher Strunk, Rachel Weiss, Amanda Wilmsmeyer.

Absent: Lendol Calder, Kirsten Day, Gillian Lederman, Mamata Marmé; (SGA members have not yet been appointed)

I. 2016-17 Membership:

Committee roster (with pictures) was distributed and new members introduced.

Christina Myatt is no longer able to take minutes for the General Education Committee. A new secretary will be appointed by the Provost. The Committee thanks Christina for her work supporting the meetings.

II. Minutes

Motion- Lisa Seidlitz moved **“to approve the minutes of the May 11th meeting as submitted.”**

Rachel Weiss seconded.

MOTION PASSED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 11TH MEETING AS SUBMITTED.

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Consent Agenda

The consent agenda items were reviewed by the members of the committee. Items can be pulled from this agenda with a single person requesting a discussion; items need 5 affirmative votes and no Discussion votes to remain on the consent agenda. After reviewing, only one course (Chem-115) remained on the consent agenda; all others were pulled for more in-depth discussion. Approved for the consent agenda included: CHEM-115 for the PN (Trotter)

2. Course Approvals

a. PP - MUSC 304 – (Keehn)

Motion to approve the PP for MUSC-304: Elflin; Seidlitz seconded.

MOTION TO APPROVE MUSC 304 PASSES

b. PH - PHYS 305 – (J. Dyer)

Motion to table discussion of PHYS-305: Strunk; Weiss seconded

MOTION TO TABLE DISCUSSION OF PHYS 305 PASSES

c. LC - MUSC 304 and PHYS 305 (Keehn, Dyer)

Motion to approve the LC designation for MUSC-304+PHYS-305: Harrington; Seidlitz seconded.

MOTION TO APPROVE MUSC-304 + PHYS-305 AS AN LC PASSES

d. FYI 102 – Bengtson

Motion to approve FYI-102: Seidlitz, Wilmsmeyer seconded

Motion to table discussion of FYI-102: Seidlitz; Strunk seconded

MOTION TO TABLE DISCUSSION OF FYI-102 PASSES

3. Transitioning to semesters

- The Committee needs the votes on immersive term and 3 vs 4 credits before being able to tackle the details of a new general education structure.
- During the Gen Ed breakout session at the faculty retreat, faculty were prompted to write a brief narrative about what they value about a core curriculum. A summary of their responses was shared at the meeting. It was pointed out that breadth stands out as something Augie's faculty values.
- Regarding the question and worth of "breadth" raised at the retreat: Is breadth seen as a dirty word by some? Perhaps at the expense of depth? Within disciplines, introductory courses have tended to move from comprehensive surveys that introduce the breadth of a field to more focus on questions/problems in a field and how those are analyzed/approached.
- Should Learning Perspectives (LPs) stay the same as they are now (is the current system working)? If not, then what is the alternative? Examples:
 - More developmental models where first, second, third and fourth year students work on specified skills and ideas rather than able to select from topics at any point.
 - See William & Mary example shared with the committee: Somewhat hybrid of developmental and distribution models
 - More of a question/problem-based approach with single or set of questions approached from multiple perspectives
 - Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) based rather than around current Perspectives. Would need to be more behavior focused (e.g., ways of interaction). Also, as seen in Portfolio project, several SLOs better met through activities outside of the classroom.
- Current LPs are based around ways of knowing, rather than disciplinary content, but not well articulated; lacking a coherent connecting story.
- LEAP initiative: Consider making "signature work" under Gen Ed.? Specifically, Senior Inquiry (SI) is not a graduation requirement but, rather, major requirements. If moved into Gen Ed, can monitor shared requirements and expectations which are much more aligned with what AAC&U describes as Signature Work.
 - Would need to work with where oversight of SIs reside (department, EPC, Gen Ed)
 - Can facilitate an integrative Gen Ed culminating experience—perhaps satisfying the intent behind Learning Communities (LCs)
 - Can help smooth student understanding of requirements, especially with regard to double-majors.
- What are people *outside* the Gen Ed committee thinking about size, scope or structure of the core curriculum? Seems many feel it hinges on 3 vs 4 credit vote (although percentage-wise, the expectation remains more or less constant)
- Gen Ed proposal, at least of structure, needs to be in place prior to Departments being fully able to design their programs (although, obviously, there will need to be back-and-forth as each is developed)

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS and DISCUSSION

a. Foreign Language language

The label “foreign language” in the graduation requirements does not fully reflect the requirement for all students (e.g., international students) and is no longer broadly accepted description. The requirement is more accurately a “second” language, rather than one that is necessarily “foreign.”

It was suggested that simply “Language Requirement” was adequate with a label of “foreign” or “second” being unnecessary when noting the graduation requirement.

b. Continue to revamp proposal forms or hold off?

Mike Egan acknowledged the hard work of the committee on the proposal form revisions and that the efforts will undoubtedly contribute to the new iteration of requirements that emerge from semester conversion. However, the effort to revise the forms will be on hold so the committee can focus on conversion issues.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffrey Ratliff-Crain