

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Educational Policies Committee

Faculty Senate

3-17-2015

General Education Subcommittee Minutes, March 17, 2015

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_edpol

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "General Education Subcommittee Minutes, March 17, 2015" (2015). *Educational Policies Committee*. Paper 974.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_edpol/974

This General Education Subcommittee Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Policies Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.





GENERAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

March 17, 2015, 8:30 A.M.
Champ Hall Conference Room

Present: Norm Jones, Chair; Dean Adams, Engineering; Eddy Berry, Social Sciences; Harrison Kleiner, Connections; Mary Leavitt, Advising; Kacy Lundstrom, Library; Kris Miller, Honors; Melanie Nelson, USU Eastern; Lee Rickords, Agriculture and Applied Sciences; Michele Hillard, Secretary; Dawn Kirby, Humanities and Social Sciences; Shelley Lindauer, Education and Human Services; Brian McCuskey, Humanities; Karen Mock, Natural Resources; Bob Mueller, Regional Campus; Lawrence Culver, American Institutions; Dan Coster, Quantitative Intensive; Brock Dethier, Writing Program

Absent: Doug Fiefia, USUSA President; Larry Smith, Provost's Office; Stephanie Hamblin, University Advising; Kathy Chudoba, Business; Ryan Dupont, Life and Physical Sciences; Laura Gelfand, Arts; Dick Mueller, Science; Janet Anderson, Provost's Office; Cindy Dewey, Creative Arts; John Mortensen, Student Services

Visitors: Kelsey Hall, CI Subcommittee Member; Brad Hall, CI Subcommittee Member

Call to Order – Norm Jones

Approval of Minutes – February 17, 2015

Motion to approve minutes made by Eddy Berry. Seconded by Dean Adams.

Course Approvals

N/A

Course/Designation Removals

N/A

Syllabi Approvals

ANTH 3110-001 (DSS) Judson Finley **PENDING** Eddy Berry

CMST 4570 (QI) Lisa Guntzviller **APPROVED** Dan Coster

Motion to approve made by Dan Coster. Seconded by Brian McCuskey.

HIST/RELS 3270 (DHA) Danielle Ross **APPROVED** Brian McCuskey

Motion to approve made by Dawn Kirby. Seconded by Shelley Lindauer.

HIST/RELS 4565 (DHA) Danielle Ross **APPROVED** Brian McCuskey

Motion to approve made by Brian McCuskey. Seconded by Kris Miller.

HONR 3010 (QI) **WITHDRAWN**Dan Coster

HONR 3020 (CI) **WITHDRAWN** Brock Dethier

HONR 3030 (CI) **WITHDRAWN** Brock Dethier

HONR 3035 (QI) **WITHDRAWN**Dan Coster

MUSC 3030 (DSS) Kevin Olson **APPROVED** Eddy Berry
Motion to approve made by Eddy Berry. Seconded by Dawn Kirby.

PHYS 2210 (BPS) Jan Sojka **PENDING**Ryan Dupont

POLS 4460 (CI) **PENDING**..... Brock Dethier

THEA 1000 (BCA) Richie Call **PENDING**.....Cindy Dewey

Business

Brock Dethier, Chair of the Communications Intensive Subcommittee, is asking for clarification of the policy changes made to the CI designation made on Feb. 20, 2015. Here are his observations:

1. Whatever the intent, last month's change in the Communication Intensive Criteria from "written AND oral communication" to "written AND/OR oral communication" means that any activity that would formerly have satisfied the oral component now qualifies a course for the CI designation even if no writing is involved. We have always accepted a five-minute solo PowerPoint, for instance, as adequate for the oral component. Now such a presentation earns a course a CI by itself.
2. So what can we do?
 - a. Create a new, much tougher standard for the oral component, so that the new CI definition would have some meaning.
 - b. Eliminate the CI standard entirely. I'd hate to do it, but I'd also hate to administer a watered-down standard.
 - c. Eliminate the oral component entirely, but keep a robust written component.
 Cutting the old standard in half would certainly be a blow to students' education, but it would be better than the potential race-to-the-bottom that the "and/or" could create.
 - d. Approve the new language from the Communication committee (which relaxed, rather than tightened the requirement for the oral component) and let the committee do its job. Make courses fit the standard rather than change the standard to fit huge courses.

- e. Create a WI (Writing Intensive) designation and an OI (Oral Intensive) designation and require one of each? Or allow each major to choose what combination it wants? I foresee administrative nightmares, but perhaps only in the short term.

Policy as it currently stands. (Recent amendments are marked in red)

Criteria for Communication Intensive Courses

Philosophy

The purpose of Communication Intensive courses is to help students achieve proficiency in both written and oral communication in a manner that is appropriate to their major discipline. Although CI courses must meet specific criteria, there are many possibilities for how those criteria may be achieved. CI courses may use a range of artistic and technological forms of communication.

All CI courses must help students engage productively, responsibly, and thoughtfully in written and oral communication. CI courses are also intended to be discipline-specific, letting students simultaneously attain communication fluency goals while they learn communication forms most appropriate to their discipline.

Communication Intensive Course Criteria

All Communication Intensive courses must:

1. Be an upper division course.
2. Require both written and/or oral communication.
3. Require a significant quantity of written and/or oral communication as demonstrated by the outcomes, assignments, and assessment in the course.
4. Have an individual writing component.
5. Incorporate communication/learning components that reinforce effective two-way communication skills appropriate for discipline-specific audiences.
6. Allow for continued improvement through opportunities for revision, and/or multiple assignments.

Communication Intensive courses are encouraged to:

1. Utilize collaborative forms of communication.
2. Be explicit with students about how the discipline communicates and invite them into its ways of communication.
3. Utilize a wide variety of communication forms and media.
4. Incorporate communication activities that are appropriate for a wide variety of disciplinary audiences.

Communication Intensive Implementation Ideas

To clarify Communication Intensive requirements listed above, and to encourage thinking “outside the box,” we list some key terms below and suggest a variety of ways to implement them.

Continual Improvement:

1. Students may write multiple drafts of a single paper, with the opportunity to implement feedback and suggestions in the final paper.
2. The instructor may assign several papers of the same type. Constructive feedback is provided on the early assignments so students can apply this information to succeeding assignments.
3. The student may be offered the opportunity to revise a paper after it has been graded.

Feedback:

1. Feedback is response to student writing in the form of constructive criticism and suggestions for improvement.
2. Feedback can come from peers, the instructor, or Graduate Assistants, Writing Fellows, Undergraduate Teaching Fellows, external audiences, or others.
3. Feedback may be oral or written.

NEW LANGUAGE APPROVED FEB. 20, 2015

Oral Communication:

Each applicant for the CI designation stressing oral communication should explain how the course in question gives students practice, feedback, and/or instruction in oral communication relevant and useful to the specific discipline. The following are some ways oral communication has been incorporated into courses, but this is not a complete list. The Communication Committee welcomes the use of discipline-appropriate ways of meeting the CI goals.

Students may communicate orally in a wide variety of formats. Some examples include the following:

1. Make a formal presentation to a class or subgroup of a class, an outside audience, or the instructor.
2. Make a formal presentation using video format or other presentation software.
3. Perform in a dramatic presentation or other oral reading.
4. Participate in structured in-class debates with assigned roles.
5. Lead structured discussions by doing such things as introducing the reading, synthesizing class materials and audience responses, summarizing at the end of class, or reading and paraphrasing important but not required articles.
6. Have the class join or create a mock-conference with poster or PowerPoint presentations.
7. Create podcasts or YouTube videos.

HERE IS THE OLD LANGUAGE:

Oral Communication:

Students may communicate orally in a wide variety of formats. Some examples include the following:

1. Make a formal presentation to a class or subgroup of a class, an outside audience, or the instructor.
2. Make a formal presentation using video format or other presentation software.
3. Perform in a dramatic presentation or other oral reading.
4. Participate in structured in-class debates with assigned roles.
5. Lead structured discussions synthesizing class materials and audience responses."

Collaboration:

1. Collaboration includes an occasion in which students talk to, or work with each other, a client outside the classroom, or an instructor to produce something.
2. Collaboration can include occasions in which students provide feedback on each other's work.

Motion to return to the original verbiage in points 2 and 3 of the policy (remove "/or") made by Dean Adams. Seconded by Harrison Kleiner.

Vote taken: 12 yea – 2 Nay – 1 Abstain

Motion to begin a study on CI courses made by Karen Mock. Seconded by Shelley Lindauer. Motion carried. The CI Subcommittee will draft a rubric for a survey of department heads concerning CI courses they currently offer or might offer.

Update on the Water Cluster discussion

Everything is going well and meetings continue to be held.

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 am