

**MINUTES**  
**PATHWAYS GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**APRIL 26, 2023**  
**2:00 PM – 4:00 PM**  
**VIA ZOOM: <https://virginiatech.zoom.us/j/86054133718>**

**Present:** Page Fetter, Jennifer Friedel, Creed Jones, Jason Malone, Shakil Rabbi, Jen Rainville, Kerry Redican, Annie Ronan, Hannah Shinault

**Absent:** Katlyn Griffin, Tom Hammett, Grant Hamming

**Guests:** Stephen Biscotte, Jenni Gallagher, Gary Costello, Stefan Duma, Paul Heilker, Jean Lacoste, Michelle Moseley, Jason Sharp

**Call to Order** by Hannah Shinault at 2:01 pm

**Announcements**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences**

- 1. Minor:** Change of academic unit housing minor from “Department of Human Development and Family Science” to “College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences Dean’s Office,” and rename to Pathways Minor: Disability Studies (DST); effective for student date of entry under UG Catalog 2023-24; first term and year to enroll: Summer 2023; first term and year to graduate: Spring 2024 (CM 7943)

*With approval of change of academic unit housing minor and renaming to Pathways Minor: Disability Studies (DST), Pathways Minor: Disabilities Studies (DSST) will be discontinued; effective for student date of entry under UG Catalog 2023-24; last term and year to enroll: Spring 2023; last term and year to graduate: Spring 2027 (CM 7943)*

**Proposer:** Carlos Evia

**Primary Reviewer:** Page Fetter

**Secondary Reviewer:** Jason Malone

*Note: This proposal was deferred at the 4/12/23 meeting.*

**Approved:** Unanimous

**Honors College**

- 2. Course:** UH 4504: Topics in Honors Discovery and Innovation Studios (Revised) (Critique and Practice in Design G06d, Ethical Reasoning G10) Fall 2023 (CM 7898)

**Proposer:** Paul Heilker  
**Primary Reviewer:** Annie Ronan  
**Secondary Reviewer:** Shakil Rabbi

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Needs more clarity in terms of the object of the experiential engagement. I think this can be hard, but given the focus on the syllabi below, that might be a way to talk about this. That is how one designs an activity or some sort of learning experience.

**Modification:** Pg 2 – Catalog description - Is there a way to add more (than simply “design thinking”) to align the course with CPDA? Language connected to learning objective #3, for instance? (“use multiple iterations of the design process...”)

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives - Overall: These LOs are not the same as those in the pages below - there are 6 here and there are 5 below - LO 4 is missing

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives – LO #1 - Please add language to make this more specific to Critical Practice in Design and the Arts.

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives – LO #2 - Consider omitting “concrete” (when dealing in design, solutions may not result in a physical, material form)

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives – LO #2 - needs to include the term identification to align more explicitly with ethical reasoning SLO2

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives – LO #3 - Again, consider omitting “concrete.” Would it be more appropriate to use the Pathways language here (“Produce a fully developed solution through iterative processes of design”) This signifies that processes and principles from design fields will be used, rather than simply that the design will be iterated.

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives – LO #3 - Needs to have language that echoes SLO ethical reasoning more directly – ‘address the problem in a reasoned manner’?

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives – LO #4 - the alignment with ER 2 and 3 is not immediately obvious. Furthermore, how could this learning objective be assessed? Perhaps rewording LO#3 to be closer to the CPDA language would cover this, as “iterative processes of design” suggests the use of iterative methods derived from design fields, and these methods have the “valu[ing] of uncertainty” etc already baked in...

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives – LO #5 - Might it be worthwhile to signal that students would be using “skills, tools, and methods of working in design” to perform these assessments? This would strengthen the course’s alignment with CPDA

**Modification:** Pg 2 - Learning Objectives – LO #6 - The alignment with ER 3 is so clear. To simplify assessment/alignment consider eliminating ER2 (which is well covered by LO#2)

**Modification:** Pg 2 – Justification - The language of ethic and design thinking could be more explicit in this section, which is a general statement for all of this course.

**Modification:** Pg 2 – Justification - Hyphenate “21st-century”

**Modification:** Pg 2 – Justification - Currently only one sentence that mentions design. Perhaps this could be expanded upon to clarify alignment with CPDA?

**Modification:** Pg 4 – Texts and Special Teaching Aids - Example Syllabus #1 does not contain texts from the discipline of design (neither practice nor history)

**Modification:** Pg 5 – Topic Syllabus - Both topic syllabi begin with a topic (“Location and analysis of critical problems in [X]”) that aligns with LO#1. However, in either case it is not apparent how these topics would serve as an opportunity to assess CPDA 3 (“Apply interpretive strategies or methodologies in design or the arts”). For instance, would the interpretive strategies or methodologies of design necessarily be used in “the location and analysis of critical problems in data analysis for healthcare reform?” If we’re meant to assume that design thinking would be used, then the third topic (“design thinking...in data analysis for healthcare reform”) seems redundant.

**Modification:** Pg 5 – Topic Syllabus - In general, neither seem particularly aligned with CPDA

**Modification:** Pg 5 – Topic Syllabus - So how do these syllabi connect to design and the arts and ethical reasoning? Does not follow that they align with design or ethical reasoning as explicitly as it could be. The details below and above highlight the idea of iterative thinking processes and so these could be connected to design and ethical reasoning.

**Modification:** Pg 6 – There is no emphasis on ethical reasoning here - could be part of assessment and transdisciplinary collaboration but it should be explicit (these topics are not the same as the LOs, which does not have to be the same, but since you do use most of them pretty directly the question is what happens to LO 4)

**Modification:** Pg 7 – Mission - The main common term here is iterative thinking, which is not aligned with as explicitly with the main goals of design and ethical reasoning. Those might be the main ways it could be framed here - rather than iterative thinking or processes.

**Modification:** Pg 7 – Mission - Please mention “design” here

**Modification:** Pg 8 – Integration/Inclusivity/Relevance - Although I wouldn’t necessarily say that it is essential that each one of these responses mention “design,” the fact that the term doesn’t appear at all may be a problem worth addressing.

**Modification:** Pg 8 – CPDA 3 - I appreciate the specificity of the example, however the methods described here do not sound specific to “design or the arts.” Perhaps I am mistaken? I would be curious what my colleagues in design would think of this.

**Modification:** Pg 8 – CPDA 3 - The answers are all about iterative thinking and not about design. These are modes of analysis and not necessarily about design. You could frame those answers in terms of design thinking about research and understanding the problem. You could also explain it in terms of communication

to stakeholders. As they are phrased, there is little direct alignment with the concepts of design or the SLOs for Design in Pathways.

**Modification:** Pg 11 – CPDA 4 – Convergent/divergent thinking is, as I understand it, a tool for creative problem solving more generally. I worry that this description is, again, not specific enough to CPDA.

**Modification:** Pg 11 – CPDA 5 - Not as alarming as the other CPDA narratives, but I would feel more comfortable with a narrative that foregrounded the presence of “design”

**Tabled:** Unanimous

## NEW BUSINESS

### College of Architecture, Arts, and Design

**3. Course:** ART 3024: History of Global Print Culture (New) (Critique and Practice in Design and the Arts G06ad, Critical Analysis of Identity and Equity in the U.S. G07, Intercultural and Global Awareness G11) Fall 2023 (CM 7794)

**Proposer:** Michelle Moseley

**Primary Reviewer:** Katlyn Griffin

**Secondary Reviewer:** Jen Friedel

**Modification:** Catalog Description, page 2: Simplify language. For example, “Global print culture. Visual arts and design forms . . .” Remove “topical issues include.” Remove one of the references to print culture’s inception.

**Modification:** Learning Objectives, page 2: Consider aligning each learning outcome to only one learning objective. Critique and Practice in Design #2 is listed twice as is Equity & Identity #3, and they each only need to be listed once.

**Approved with Modifications:** Unanimous

### College of Engineering

**4. Course:** BMES 3004: Helmet Design: Biomechanics to Health & Social Disparities in Sports (New) (Reasoning in the Social Sciences G03, Critical Analysis of Identity and Equity in the U.S. G07, Ethical Reasoning G10) Fall 2023 (CM 8089)

**Proposer:** Stefan Duma

**Primary Reviewer:** Tom Hammett

**Secondary Reviewer:** Grant Hamming

**Modification:** edit effective semester to Fall 2023

**Modification:** Consider removing second space after full stops throughout proposal.

**Modification:** Catalog Description, page 2: consider changing language from future to present tense.

**Modification:** Catalog Description, page 2: consider revising for brevity; complete sentences not necessary. Ex. Revise “This course will provide” to “Provides”

**Modification:** Catalog Description, page 2: Increase the parallel language among catalog description, learning outcomes, and topic syllabus, such as:

- “investigate how sex and gender roles have shaped...”
- “compare the complex social dynamics of sex and gender...”
- “Sex and gender implications in sports equipment”

**Modification:** Learning Objectives, page 2: LO#2, clarify how this addresses Ethical Reasoning #3, or remove alignment of ER #3 to this objective and just align it with LO#7

**Modification:** Learning Objectives, page 2: LO#6, clarify how this addresses Ethical Reasoning #2

**Modification:** Justification, page 2: Address the ethics component here

**Modification:** Topic Syllabus, page 4: Include more explicit reference to ethics

**Modification:** Narrative, page 5: - Integration mentions sex and gender, inclusivity only sex, relevance only gender – consider refining this usage

**Modification:** RSS #3, page 7: Consider removing “interestingly”

**Modification:** Student Learning Outcomes, pages 7-11: Include more information on the types of assessment used. Are there assessments other than the three exams and lab reports?

**Approved with Modifications:** Unanimous

### **College of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences**

**5. Minor:** Revision of Pathways Minor: Adaptive Brain and Behavior (ABB): effective for student date of entry under UG Catalog 2023-24 (CM 7869)

**Proposer:** Victoria Lael

**Primary Reviewer:** Page Fetter

**Secondary Reviewer:** Jen Rainville

*Note: this proposal is on 15-day review until 4/25/23. If requested revisions have not been made by 4/25/23, this item will be moved to a future agenda.*

**Approved:** Unanimous

### **Pamplin College of Business**

**6. Course:** ACIS 1504: Introduction to Business Analytics & Business Intelligence (Revised) (Foundational Quantitative and Computational Thinking G05f, Ethical Reasoning G10) Fall 2023 (CM 8098)

**Proposers:** Jason Sharp, Jean Lacoste  
**Primary Reviewer:** Kerry Redican  
**Secondary Reviewer:** Creed Jones

**Modification:** Catalog Description, page 2: In the last sentence in the catalog description eliminate “Also focused on” and begin the sentence with Identifying...

**Modification:** Learning Objectives, page 2: Consider having the Learning Objectives meet just one of the Learning Outcomes, not two

**Modification:** Learning Objectives, page 2: Clarify the behaviors in Learning Objectives 1 and 2. What does Restate in LO 1 and Recognize in LO 2 mean?

**Modification:** Topic Syllabus, page 4: Consider identifying the percentages of the course related to each of the subtopics under Software Applications. This will provide a better indication of how much time is devoted to each topic since the majority of the course is focused on Software Applications and would line up clearer with the catalog description.

**Modification:** Topic Syllabus, page 4: Identify the other intro business topics

**Modification:** Quant/Comp #2, page 8: Provide more detail here. What is the context in which these questions are framed? Are the questions related to problem sets? Case studies?

**Modification:** Quant/Comp #6, page 10: Add clarification. It appears that students will “Evaluate conclusions drawn from or decisions based on quantitative data through test questions?” The context for the evaluation is “Students will be able to create and analyze different types of financial functions.....” This doesn’t seem to fit with the description of the exam questions

**Modification:** ER #1, page 11: Reference the ethical theories students will explore. The ethical theories presented appear to be ethical issues. For example, Does profit come first or is it secondary to the welfare of society? Is this an ethical theory or an ethical issue that would need to be evaluated through application of an ethical theory?

**Modification:** ER #2, page 11: clarify how students could be evaluated with an exam when the Learning Outcome is focusing on skill

**Approved with Modifications:** Unanimous

**Meeting adjourned** by Hannah Shinault at 2:47 pm

*Minutes compiled by Jenni Gallagher*