FSEM Committee Meeting Tuesday, November 22, 2022

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

1. Proposal revisions:

- a. Rachel Graefe-Anderson, Life Auditing: Fiscal Fitness
 - i. We are not sure if the Student Life Audit and the Personal Financial Plan are one assignment or two. The syllabus should provide more information on how these assignments work together.
 - ii. There should be draft deadlines that provide enough time for students to revise their work before final submission. We suggest adding columns to the "Activities" table for the due dates for the drafts and final papers to make this clearer.

iii. Accept with minimal revisions.

- b. Chris Cosans, The Human Animal
 - i. The syllabus includes reference to a paper draft, but it is given as optional. Students have to be required to revise their papers (not just their abstracts) at least once.
 - ii. Also, we recommend that students have at least two weeks between receiving instructor feedback and having the final paper due.
 - iii. Also the dates given in the syllabus don't seem right, please double-check them.
 - iv. The syllabus should be updated to include the latest language from the provost's office for the required sections (COVID statement etc.)

v. Accept with minimal revisions.

- c. L. Ashe Laughlin, Creating Art & Ideas
 - The syllabus still does not have sufficiently detailed information on the assignments given, including minimum page numbers for writing assignments.
 - ii. We recommend having the draft due before Thanksgiving so that students will have it back in time to make changes.
 - iii. The dates for advising week are listed too late in the semester.
 - iv. The syllabus should be updated to include the latest language from the provost's office for the required sections (Title IX etc.)
 - v. Accept with revisions.

- d. The History of American Disasters, Juliette Landphair
 - i. This proposal is under the history department chair. It will need to be approved there before we can officially approve it.

ii. Accept.

- e. American Political Polarization, Jared McDonald
 - i. This proposal is under the chair of political science. It needs to be approved there before we can officially approve it.
 - ii. The CRAAP module should be replaced with the newer library module.
 - iii. We weren't sure of the difference between classes 19 and 21.
 - iv. It doesn't explicitly say that the feedback on the paper draft is from the instructor (as opposed to peers). Feedback from the instructor is important.
 - v. Accept.