Present: Angela Anderson, Aaron Ansell, Stephen Biscotte, Corinne Guimont, Aaron Goldstein, Mike Gordon, Molly Hall, Earl Kline, Victoria Lael, Jason Malone, Nicole Pitterson, Annie Ronan, Lauren Thomas, Stacy Vogt Yuan, Sparkle Williams

Absent: Hailey Annibell, Janet Hilder, Madeline Stewart, Khanh Ngoc Tran

Guests: Jenni Gallagher, Carmen Gitre

Call to order by A. Ansell at 2:32 pm

Announcements:

- New members: Madeline Stewart and Hailey Annibell from USS; Mike Gordon from PCOB, Stacy Vogt Yuan from CLAHS
- Moving 3/6 meeting to 3/13 due to spring break

1. Proposal Review

The committee re-reviewed HIST 2624: Topics in the History of Data in Social Context for Advanced Discourse, which had been tabled at the last meeting.

The committee asked that the following changes be made, after which they will review the proposal again:

- Revise the learning objectives and topic syllabus to better reflect the quant/comp learning outcomes. The committee thought this was done very well in the HIST 2604 proposal, and suggested to use that as a model.
- Increase the number of learning objectives so that alignment with the individual Pathways SLOs is clearer.
- Consider making alignment with the discourse SLOs clearer as well.

2. Courseleaf Training

J. Gallagher provided a brief walkthrough of the Courseleaf system (see Appendix A) since members may be occasionally asked to review proposals.

3. Course Recertification

S. Biscotte shared that there have been discussions across campus about how to keep the Pathways curriculum vibrant and ensure that approved courses continue to be well-aligned with the Pathways concepts they were approved for.
The committee discussed possible strategies for evaluating concept alignment across the program on a regular basis (e.g., perhaps every five years).

The committee agreed that the Program Improvement Subcommittee should continue researching this topic and bring ideas forward to the full committee for discussion.

4. Subcommittee Reports

Advising

V. Lael: The subcommittee has not met yet this semester because they were waiting on results of student survey. Now that they have them, they will review them and provide feedback to the full committee.

Program Improvement

A. Ansell: The subcommittee has been working on a process to ensure continuous Pathways concept alignment (see item 3 above).

Pathways Plus

S. Biscotte: The subcommittee has not met yet this semester. They will be considering whether there is still work to do for this subcommittee or if they should join other subcommittees.

A. Ansell adjourned the meeting at 3:45 pm.

Minutes compiled by Jenni Gallagher
1. Identify which proposal(s) you were assigned for review.

The Office of Gen Ed will notify you by email when you have been assigned to review a proposal. Each proposal will be assigned to a primary and a secondary reviewer. Please coordinate with one another so that the proposer only receives one email with your comments (see step #6 below).

2. Open the proposal in Courseleaf.

   a. If you are reviewing a course proposal, log into https://vt-next.courseleaf.com/courseadmin/.
      If you are reviewing a minor proposal, log into https://vt-next.courseleaf.com/programadmin/.

   b. Type the CIM # or course/minor name into the search bar and click “search.”

   c. Scroll down to view the proposal.

3. Export proposal to PDF to ensure you are reviewing the most up-to-date version.
4. Review your assigned proposal(s), making notes of any edits or clarifications needed. For consistency across reviewers, please provide points of feedback in the following format:

- Section of proposal: Comment

  For example:

- Learning Objectives: Consider aligning LO#2 with RSS #4 instead of RSS #3.
- Inclusivity: Please add a sentence or two on how the instructor will support all learners in succeeding in the class, as well as ways they might incorporate diverse perspectives and experiences into the course (e.g., diverse authors of texts, issues that might impact certain groups differently than others, etc.).
- Reasoning in the Social Sciences: Please clarify how the instructor will assess students’ acquisition of this learning outcome.

5. Coordinate with your co-reviewer to compile your comments and email them to the proposer. A sample email can be found below. Please copy Jenni (jennigal@vt.edu) and Brandy (brandy11@vt.edu) on this email so that they can add your comments to Courseleaf.

Dear [proposer’s name]:

I, along with [co-reviewer’s name] (cc’d here), have reviewed your proposal for [course dept/number or minor name] for the upcoming UCCGE meeting. We are providing our comments below so that you may have an opportunity to review them prior to the meeting.

At the meeting, which you are encouraged but not required to attend, you may ask any clarifying questions or indicate how you might respond to our various concerns. However, please do not make any revisions between now and the meeting, as concerns may be resolved or additional issues may be raised during the meeting. The day after the meeting, you will receive an email from the Office of General Education with an official list of requested revisions. At that time, you can revise your proposal.

[Insert bulleted proposal comments here]

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions about this feedback. We look forward to seeing your proposal come before the committee.

Best,
[your & your co-reviewer’s names]