

**GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**April 24, 2013**  
**Olin 304**

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

**Members Present:** Richie Benson, Stefanie Bluemle, Patrick Crawford, Kristin Douglas, Mike Egan, Meg Gillette, Janene Finley, Carrie Hough, Rick Jaeschke, Virginia Johnson, Brian Katz, John Pfautz, Rowen Schussheim-Anderson

**Guests Present:** Mary Koski

**1. Revised LSFY Matrix Discussion**

Meg Gillette provided the latest draft of the First-Year Inquiry Skills Matrix. Deletions were marked with a strike-through, and highlights marked what the LSFY group feels are substantial changes to the curriculum. There is an addition of a portfolio assignment for 101; an addition of two short They Say, I Say papers to 102, addition of two library visits in 103. Two significant changes are the use of They Say, I Say in only one term, instead of all three, which is the current practice, and also the omission of historical parameters because they are ill-defined.

Stefanie Bluemle provided the sentence-like Information Literacy skills which are the original outcomes that the shortened versions on the matrix were derived from, which are based on assessment projects from the last two years:

LSFY 101: Consult and distinguish among a variety of resources in order to explore topics and develop questions.

LSFY 102: Identify and evaluate several potential sources in the context of the research needed in order to select the best source.

LSFY 103: Synthesize multiple thoughtfully-selected sources in order to develop a cohesive argument.

Stefanie offered to word-smith the sentences more to develop clearer, shortened forms so that people understand their meaning. A Gen Ed member asked that something be developed for 101 because although students are able to find a source, they may not know why they are finding it or how it might be used. Another member mentioned that the 103 skills do not make it clear if it is information literacy (what will happen in the final product of the research paper), and perhaps belongs in the writing section. Meg questions refining the research question versus topic, especially if we move toward a model that is about inquiry. She says that it is a new endeavor for students to pose a question, instead of just writing about something. Other committee members agreed that to teach that skill much earlier would be desirable. Meg suggested adding a bullet about thesis writing.

The idea of an LSFY Advisory Board was commended; however it was mentioned that the Gen Ed Committee would continue to have oversight of LSFY matters. Ultimately the responsibility for assessing LSFY rests with the Gen Ed Committee.

A suggestion was made to change “annotating” for the reading piece, to “exploratory reading through annotating text”. A suggestion was made to be more explicit with defining what the portfolio was for so that people know what to do with it.

They Say, I Say is addressed only in one term in the matrix. Concern was expressed that it is difficult to get through it in one term. A comment was made that LSFY faculty could analyze the results of teaching it in only one term, but that the Gen Ed Committee may need to revisit this discussion next year. Meg Gillette was supportive of the suggestion to include it in all three terms, keeping the same division between the skills. Virginia offered to suggest a few chapters of the book to be used for LSF 101.

Kristin Douglas reported that she investigated how the last LSFY Skills Matrix was approved through governance. It started with a group of faculty who were teaching the courses who developed the matrix and sent it to the Gen Ed Committee for approval and that is where it ended. Kristin Douglas suggests following the same procedure for the revised matrix. Meg Gillette will incorporate changes suggested at this meeting and present the revised LSFY matrix to the Gen Ed Committee at its next meeting for approval by vote.

## 2. G and D Discussion

The Gen Ed chair had asked that the committee be prepared to discuss the “2011 Statement by members of African, Asian, Islamic/Middle Eastern and Latin American Studies in Support of Continuing a Global Education Requirement” document and the “Request to Continue the D Requirement” document written by Jane Simonsen in order to determine if there are skills and competencies that are included in them that should be included in the ICC rubric. Comments from committee members regarding the two documents:

- In the “G” document, it was noticed that there are ways of framing an argument that would leave out a lot of WGS classes. This brings awareness that one must be intentional about the language used to frame intercultural competencies.
- The following paragraph as stated in the “D” document is exactly what we want “D” to be, but “D” courses never really did this: *“As Augustana implements Augie Choice, many students will choose to go abroad; many, on the other hand, will choose internships within the U.S. Students who approach work in communities different from their own without sufficient understanding of domestic cultural diversity may approach these experiences with a simplistic vision, either seeing themselves as benevolent helpers of those defined only by their need, or interpret the optimism of the communities they encounter in ways that obscure the complexity of oppression and privilege.”*
- The two documents do point to desired outcomes, however, those outcomes were not well articulated in the past and it is the Gen Ed Committee’s charge now to do that.
- While these documents provided a good rationale for students being globally aware, internationalized, etc., specific skills that students need to be taught were not included in the documents.
- The goal has to be generalizing, so that we generalize from two different experiences with difference to something that actually is a generalized skill beyond that particular content, or even by lenses used by those two particular things. The focus should be on how these courses are connected to each other in a way that leads to a generalized ability to deal with difference. The developmental approach would accomplish this. A comment to add to this was that the emphasis on content in many courses is that there is both learning perspectives and suffixes attached to them.

Kristin Douglas suggested that the committee have another discussion looking at PS and PH to see how much overlap there is with ICC.

## 5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski  
Office of Academic Affairs