

FSEM Committee Meeting
Tuesday, November 1, 2022

Present: Bridgette Dennett, Ian Finlayson (secretary), Jennifer Hansen-Glucklich (chair), Marcus Leppanen, Jennifer Walker, April Wynn (ex-officio).

1. Add instructor proposals:
 - a. Chris Cosans, The Amusement Park: Yesterday's Pastime, Today's Thrill
 - i. The proposer is an adjunct instructor. We will review the course as a possible FSEM course, but the course being scheduled as taught by an adjunct instructor is not our decision.
 - ii. We suggest that the course include more speaking assignments, such as an informal presentation or leading a discussion.
 - iii. The syllabus contains one reference to Wes Hillyard, the previous instructor of this course.
 - iv. The word "presentation" spelled wrong in the graphic on page 2.
 - v. We recommend making it more clear whether the Disney book is required or not.
 - vi. Accept with minimal revisions.**
 - b. Chris Cosans, The Human Animal
 - i. There is language in the syllabus referring to it as an honor's FSEM, which should be removed.
 - ii. The required FSEM modules are missing from the syllabus.
 - iii. Students should have the opportunity to submit a draft for the final paper, and receive instructor feedback on it.
 - iv. Accept with revisions.**
 - c. Rachel Graefe-Anderson, Life Auditing: Fiscal Fitness
 - i. The syllabus needs more detailed information on the assignments given, including minimum page numbers for writing assignments.
 - ii. Visits from the centers should be included in the course schedule.
 - iii. The module on editing and revision should be earlier in the semester, so students have a chance to apply those skills to their work.
 - iv. The syllabus would ideally be written in a more friendly way, with less upper-case words. We encourage the instructor to meet with the director of the first-year experience to discuss best practices for syllabi for first-year experience.
 - v. Accept with revisions.**

- d. L. Ashe Laughlin, Creating Art & Ideas
 - i. The syllabus should have more detailed information on the assignments given, including minimum page numbers for writing assignments.
 - ii. The peer review and writing center visit are scheduled for the final week of the semester. We suggest moving them both earlier so students have more time to take the advice given into account and revise their work.
 - iii. The assignments should have more detail in terms of length and scope.
 - iv. It's unclear if the center visits listed in the schedule are individual assignments students will do on their own time, or in-class activities.
 - v. The schedule needs some adjustments as it seems to be based on a schedule from Fall 2020 when move-in day was after the start of term.
 - vi. We were not sure what the acronym "IRL" indicates in the calendar. Will those days be conducted online?
 - vii. Accept with revisions.**

2. New Course Proposals

- a. The History of American Disasters, Juliette Landphair
 - i. This proposal was not fully submitted through CIM, but just saved as a draft. We will check with the submitter to see if this was intended to be fully submitted or not.
 - ii. The schedule should have a little more detail. Some of the weeks have more bullet points than others. Are those meant to refer to meeting days? Are the individual meeting days in weeks 8 and 9 in class or out of class? What happens on the reading assignment days? In-class discussions?
 - iii. The Provost's syllabus language on things such as the Title IX statement, Disability Statement, etc. should be included in the syllabus.
 - iv. There should be a visit from academic services.
 - v. Not all of the modules listed are required, and the proposer can drop some if they so desire.
 - vi. Accept with revisions.**
- b. What's Your Story: The Craft of Storytelling, Jonathan Levin
 - i. The "CRAAP: module has been replaced by the Library module.

- ii. A visit from Academic services is needed, before registration for Spring classes.
- iii. The committee suggests considering moving the Library visit earlier in the semester so students learn research skills earlier on.
- iv. For the essays, there is only around a week between the draft being due and the final version being due. Is that sufficient time for the instructor to provide feedback to students, and for them to revise their work?
- v. Accept with minimal revisions.**
- c. Solving the Climate Crisis – a science-based approach to climate adaptation and mitigation, Pamela Grothe
 - i. Not all of the listed modules are required. The proposer can drop some, if they so desire.
 - ii. The paper draft is due on December 4th, with meetings on the 6th and 8th, and the paper is due during the final exam period. That likely is not enough time for students to revise their work, especially if the exam period is on the Monday of exam week. The committee suggests moving the draft deadline earlier.
 - iii. This course is on the higher-end in terms of workload. The committee suggests considering scaling back the workload slightly for first-year students.
 - iv. Accept with minimal revisions.**
- d. You Have To Listen To This: Connecting Through Music, Kevin Caffrey
 - i. There are no modules in the schedule. Their due dates should be included and, ideally, represented in the grading scale.
 - ii. The schedule indicates there are two meetings during week 16 (final exam week), but there is only one meeting that week (the final exam time itself).
 - iii. Each FSEM is assigned a librarian and a peer mentor. When they are assigned, they should be included in the syllabus as well.
 - iv. Accept with minimal revisions.**
- e. Travel Writing, Marie McAllister
 - i. Class visits for the library, writing center, speaking center, and academic services, should be included on the course calendar.
 - ii. The CRAAP module has been replaced with the library module.
 - iii. The academic advising period should be included in the schedule as well.

- iv. Week 14 has two Tuesdays, and Week 15 is listed as being final exam week – that would be week 16 instead.
 - v. The syllabus should make mention of instructor feedback on papers with a chance for students to revise their work.
 - vi. **Accept with minimal revisions.**
3. For proposals we need to see again, we will ask submitters to resubmit by November 14. We will plan to meet as a committee again on either the 16th or the 22nd to consider the revisions.