# ASCRC Minutes 12/8/15

GBB 205, 2:10 p.m.

## Call to Order

Members Present: D. Coffin I. Crummy, J. Eglin, B. Hillman, A. Lawrence, T. Manuel, P. Frazier, G. St. George, M. Semanoff, E. Uchimoto, G.G. Weix  
Ex-Officio Present: B. French, J. Hickman, N. Lindsay  
Members Excused: T. Bundy M. Boller, E. Engebretson, B. Holzworth, S. Smith, W. Smith Guest: U. Fluck, K. Rieser, M. Stark, M.Unkuri-Chaundhry

Minutes: The minutes from 11/24/15 were amended and approved.   
  
Communications

* Guests from the Office of International Programs, Professor Fluck, Director of Global Gateway and Marja Unkarui-Chaundhry, Director of Study Abroad, Student Exchanges, and Institutional Partnerships provided information regarding the intent of the proposed EDU 312, *Successful Education Abroad.* They believe the course is vital for study abroad students and to minimize institutional liability. It is taught as part of the job duties of the Directors. The course has been taught experimentally three times. Approximately 45-65 students take it each semester. They can choose to attend Wednesday morning or Thursday afternoon as both sessions are identical. Formerly the content was provided to students in a seminar format, and later a workshop. The course is in line with best practices nation-wide and students feel the course is worthwhile. Typically students are in their junior or senior year when they study abroad. The course does not have a text book. Students review the study abroad handbook and are provided with articles in class. In addition to the five page research paper students are asked to think about issues adjusting to new cultures for class discussion. Western Washington University has a similar course at the 300 level.

ASCRC questions the level of the course given the content in the syllabus. The committee doesn’t feel that the academic content matches other 300 level courses. The committee also suggested that class time not be used for filling out paperwork. It questioned why the EDU rubric was chosen. The proposers indicated it was chosen so that the course could be easily accessed by students. The GBLD or IDS rubric could be another possibility, but there are concerns with those options because they are not academic departments. A primary concern of the committee is the desire to have academic oversight through a department, given the course is not offered by a program with unit standards. Does education understand that it would be taking on this responsibility by signing off on the course? The requestors should contact the Department Chair Georgia Cobbs for verification. Currently the evaluations are reviewed by the Office of International Programs.

Business Items

* The Writing Committee was alerted to a letter with grammatical errors sent to students who don’t meet the requirements. The Chair of the Writing Committee contacted the author and suggested she collaborate with the Director of Composition on this type of communication in the future. The author agreed to work with the Director to improve the letter. Hopefully this incident will spark more dialog regarding information that students receive. It is critical to carefully manage the information sent to students given our present enrollment situation.

There is concern that the letter is overly bureaucratic and may intimidate new students; however, much of the letter’s content is from BOR Policy 301.1 and must be included.

* The General Education Chair Kim Reiser presented revisions to the X and Y perspectives. The primary responsibility of the General Education Committee is ongoing evaluation and assessment of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the general education requirements and criteria. The Committee has found the X and Y perspectives problematic during reviews. The perspectives have morphed into geographical regions rather than maintaining the original intent due to the broad definitions. The committee invited representatives from the Diversity Advisory Council to the discussion to revise the American and European perspective. Representatives from the Native American Indian Council attended the meeting when revision of the Indigenous and Global perspective was discussed.   
    
  The original spirit of the American and European Perspective was to cover civics, or the old Western designation. The revised learning outcomes and title (Democracy and Citizenship) are more skills focused. The General Education Committee did consider eliminating the perspective. Students need to be grounded in the responsibilities of living in a democracy and have the skills needed for the 21’st century. Although students are required to take American Government in High School, the textbooks provide a limited view of knowledge. College level courses have a much broader context.

ASCRC is concerned that the revised definition is too narrowly focused on US democracy. Democracy is not exclusive to the United States. There are other political regimes that need to be understood. The revision has more of a political focus and no longer incorporates European Studies. Professor Eglin offered revised language that removed all references to the United States.

The revised Indigenous and Global Category (Cultural and International Studies) requires a comparative component. This group is not a diversity perspective and does not automatically satisfy the Indian Education for All Legislative Mandate. The Committee discussed the possibility of an add-on requirement for Indian Education for All, similar to the MUS Core. However, Professor Shanley cautioned that courses meeting the requirement must be taught by faculty knowledgeable in the field. She does not want the Native American Studies department becoming a service department.

It was clarified that the revisions were not created to reflect the current general education course content. Ideally the revisions will invite the development of new curriculum. The Committee would like the categories to be clearly differentiated and articulated. The General Education program needs to be simplified. There is currently too much overlap in the groups. The Committee is looking at removing Cultural Studies from Historical and Cultural Studies as well. One suggestion was to remove the term “political” from group X. It would be happy to consider ASCRC’s recommendations.

Professor Eglin and Semanoff and student members P. Frazier and M. Bundie will serve on a subcommittee to edit the revision drafts prior to the first meeting of spring semester.

## Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.