

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Educational Policies Committee

Faculty Senate

2-16-2021

General Education Subcommittee Minutes, February 16, 2021

Utah State University

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

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "General Education Subcommittee Minutes, February 16, 2021" (2021). *Educational Policies Committee*. Paper 1093.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_edpol/1093

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 COMMITTEE

February 16, 2021
8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.
Zoom meeting

- Present:**
- *Lee Rickords, College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences (Chair)
 - *Christopher Scheer, Caine College of the Arts
 - *Greg Podgorski, College of Science
 - *Matt Sanders, Connections
 - *Dory Rosenberg, University Libraries
 - *Robert Mueller, Statewide Campuses/Communications Intensive
 - *Charlie Huenemann, Humanities
 - *Ryan Bosworth, Social Sciences
 - *Toni Gibbons, Registrar's Office
 - *Mykel Beorchia, University Advising
 - *Kristine Miller, University Honors Program
 - *Shelley Lindauer, Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services
 - *John Mortensen, Academic and Instructional Services
 - *Thom Fronk, College of Engineering
 - *Daniel Holland, Jon M. Huntsman School of Business
 - *David Wall, Creative Arts
 - *Daniel Coster, Quantitative Literacy/Intensive
 - *Harrison Kleiner, College of Humanities and Social Science
 - *Lawrence Culver, American Institutions
 - *Claudia Radel, S.J. & Jessie E. Quinney College of Natural Resources
 - *Paul Barr, Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
 - *Beth Buyserie, CI Committee
 - *Michelle Smith, Secretary
- Excused:**
- Steve Nelson, USU Eastern
 - Sami Ahmed, USUSA President
 - Ryan Dupont, Life and Physical Sciences

Call to Order – Lee Rickords

Approval of Minutes – January 19, 2021 (<https://usu.app.box.com/file/765909250001>)

Motion to approve the January minutes made by Shelley Lindauer

Seconded by David Wall

Approved unanimously by voting members

Course Approvals/Removals/Syllabi Approvals <https://usu.curriculog.com/>

ENVS 4550 (QI) Daniel Coster
Curriculog link: <https://usu.curriculog.com/proposal:14958/form>

Daniel explained the course and how the QI Committee came to a decision on the proposal. Without a QI rubric, they based their decision on the fact that the course did have a type of intensive QI activity worthy of the designation.

A motion was started but Bob Mueller had a question and wanted discussion on the proposal.

Discussion

Bob Mueller asked about the credits of the course. It is a one-week course, but he wanted to know how many hours in the day are also part of the course since it was three credits. The syllabus wasn't clear. Daniel Coster said he was also surprised by the week-long course being three credits. Students were to spend all their time in field work the first few days, and the quantitative activity is fulfilled in the classroom after the field work. The particular QI activity was a quantitative literacy type of activity that builds on previous statistics courses. It would involve model progression of generalized variants, perhaps a general model, and the activity each student engaged upon depended on the particular question the student researched and attempted to answer. The vote by the QI Committee was a majority decision, not unanimous, because there was uncertainty on the amount of required work and length of the course.

Bob asked if students are doing different things. Is the work required by this course comparable to other QI courses?

Daniel said the total QI assignment would require comparable work, but the number of hours may not be the same. He isn't sure what that would look like based on the proposal. It has not been taught before.

Bob questioned whether it should be a general ed course without more information.

Claudia mentioned that as she understands, the course used to be taught by ENVS previously, but was difficult to teach in the last few years due to the intensive field component. It would be geared to recreation management students. It does align with learning outcomes for the program and career goals for the students. It would be a week-long intensive course because it mimics how data is collected within the actual career field.

Greg asked if the course was a total of one week or was the experience a week long followed by classroom experience? Claudia didn't have the answer. Greg said the syllabus wasn't clear – it seemed like it was a semester course. Claudia thought they were going to have two different deliveries – one intensive and one that is a semester long – because the course would be delivered statewide.

Greg stated that he is uncomfortable because the syllabus didn't seem like an intensive course that was one week long but the proposal stated the course was one week long. They didn't match. He wanted to know if there was time in the course for students to reflect on their data or would it be a rushed week-long experience.

Bob said he was uncomfortable in approving the designation when there might be two different methods of teaching the course using the same course number.

Claudia said she wasn't certain that would be the case. She does want to support the proposal so that ENVS has the right kind of QI course for recreation management students. She said that

USU does have the option for a three-credit week-long course and that those types of courses should be allowed an option for General Education designation since some summer and May courses do have the same outcomes.

Bob said he didn't see how the syllabus showed they were getting the QI experience if they are simply collecting data for the week. He didn't feel comfortable supporting it.

Lee asked Daniel if he had any knowledge about how many hours would be involved with the quantitative activity. Daniel said that he didn't get a clear answer from the originator of the proposal in his discussions. It was clear they would collect the data, analyze it, and report on it. He didn't have knowledge on the time involved.

Lee said it sounds like the committee should ask for more information about what is being delivered within that five-day period.

Bob moved that the committee get more information on how students are spending that intensive week before moving forward.

Greg seconded the motion.

Bob also mentioned Harrison's chat comments that stated the originator should make sure that the necessary information is in the syllabus.

Motion to ask for more information approved unanimously by voting members. Additional information would be presented to the committee at the next meeting.

Toni also pointed out that any approved designations would not be given the QI designation until Fall 2022 due to current curriculum deadlines.

Claudia said that ENVIS had sought an exception for this proposal but it was contingent on approval at this meeting. She had not communicated clearly to ENVIS about the timing.

John Mortensen also pointed out that there were nonvoting members of the committee and that they used to have that language in minutes pointing out there were nonvoting members and voting members. Michelle Smith will make sure minutes contain that language differentiating between the types of committee members.

Harrison said students could be given a designation for their course on appeal in the fall if the designation was approved before then, even if the course wasn't given the designation in the catalog by Fall 2021.

Lee asked how many students would be affected by this course.

Claudia said about 30. Bob pointed out the syllabus said 14-20, but the proposal mentioned it was taught twice a year. Claudia said she knew the course was going to be taught in the fall semester and would be capped since it was intensive.

Daniel Coster and his committee would seek further information on the proposal and report to the committee next month.

Business

CI Rubric Proposal (See attachments 1, 2, and 3)..... Harrison Kleiner and Beth Buyserie

Beth Buyserie introduced the proposal of the new communications sequence rubric by stating the courses are committed to teach oral and written communication throughout the sequence, and that each sequence intentionally builds on each other. They also wanted to emphasize that teaching writing doesn't stop at CL2 but continues throughout the sequence even in CI courses. The four criteria are outlined in the outcomes.

CL1 and CL2 designations will be opened up to any course. They also wanted to ensure CL1 and CL2 designations aren't major specific courses or writing discipline courses. Any proposal for those designations must show how they teach writing across the disciplines. CI will not use course caps in those courses. For CL they have to use course caps to teach intensive writing.

Beth explained the rubric after revisions were made by the committee following the feedback of the Gen Ed Committee. The rubric's intention was to state what is learned in each course and progression through the sequence. Beth briefly explained the criteria of each rubric. The intention for CL1 was that students demonstrate an "adequate" ability to write. Currently English 1010 is the only CL1 course. Students should not have only an "adequate" ability to write by the end of CI. However, they didn't want to indicate at the end of CL1 that students couldn't write. They just write at the level of CL1.

Harrison said there was a word changed on the rubric following the Gen Ed Committee discussion in December. They removed "satisfactory" from the language and replaced it with "adequate".

Beth said the other major change on the rubric was concerning engaging with credible and relevant text sources. CI courses engage with texts in some way but not in terms of academic research. The CI milestone previously stated that within each major, students will skillfully develop their ability to use sources within their discipline, but the rubric now says students will further develop their ability to thoughtfully engage with and incorporate credible and relevant sources within their discipline. The CI Committee wanted CI designations to use text sources, and for proposals to explain how they would be engaging with sources. By USHE's code, CL1 and CL2 must use sources, but CI courses don't necessarily have to engage in research with texts. CI courses do still need to engage with text sources.

Harrison said the sequence page of the rubric was geared to students and instructors. It would help students so they know the learning outcomes they should look to when they take these courses, and it is also for instructors so they know what students were expected to accomplish in previous CI courses of the sequence. The faculty will use the rubrics when they propose courses.

Beth also stated that the rubrics should help improve the quality of Gen Ed proposals. Instead of focusing on the amount in terms of word count or how much oral communication is required, proposals should also speak to how they will teach quality of writing.

Harrison said it might be a shift in mindset for CI instructors. Previously they had to have "enough" writing and oral work. Now they have to show in their syllabus how they are achieving proficiency. How are instructors helping students improve their writing? It will be a process over time.

Dory thanked Harrison and Beth for using her feedback in their rubrics. Beth said that the rubric was meant to promote teaching writing throughout course work with more approaches to this outcome.

Harrison said that the Communication Committee (he proposed it should be renamed from the CI Committee since they are also reviewing CL courses) is proposing that the Gen Ed Committee accept the proficiencies and outcomes.

Daniel Coster said he wasn't present at past discussions and asked about the situation where there was a 5000-level course in statistics with a CI designation taught to grad and undergrad students, how do they deal with the idea that undergraduates are to achieve the outcomes of a CI designation but graduate students do not?

Harrison said he felt that from the point of view of the committee, it was somewhat irrelevant since the Gen Ed Committee is over undergraduate designations. If there are people taking the course who don't need the CI, and as long as the course achieves the CI outcomes, it is still a CI course. Because the grad students don't need the CI designation is irrelevant.

Lawrence asked how the courses are fitting in the overall education. For example, the lower CL courses are English courses, but the CI courses are much more major specific. It assumes that majors will be teaching enough CI courses with enough seats to fulfill the desire for the designation. Will this cause a bottleneck within majors that have less CI courses?

Harrison said that it is the case already that CI and QI courses are built into every major on campus. They are supposed to be accomplished within their major. Students may also take CI courses who are not interested in the designation but the topic. There are a handful of majors that don't have CI built out but that is an exception, not the rule. The CI Committee wanted to write the CI outcomes to be inclusive so that existing quality CI courses won't be threatened by the new CI outcomes.

Beth also stated that the CI Committee are not trying to shift CI so that they are only teaching writing within the majors. Students from other majors can also enroll in CI courses within a different major.

Bob motioned that they accept the rubrics for CL1, CL2, and CI courses.

Matt Sanders seconded the motion.

Daniel Coster abstained; the remaining voting members voted aye.

Harrison also made one additional comment to thank Beth, Bob, Brad, Kelsey, Dory, and others on the working group who contributed to the CI outcomes. It was a large effort over the past year and a half.

The next part of this conversation is talking about what type of instructional and student support will be needed for faculty to help students achieve and demonstrate communication proficiency, especially for faculty teaching a large group of students. Provost Galey is keen on engaging in that question to provide more support to faculty. Resources need to follow the promise of what will be accomplished. More will be forthcoming.

Adjourned at 9:12 a.m.