History Notes

Chair: Kim Klimek
Scribe: Kim Black

General Comments
- Started with some questions about who wrote the competency and learning outcomes.
- Concerns about whether the criteria and outcomes may not match up with stated LEAP agenda which was said to be about outcomes, not inputs. These seem to be inputs not outcomes.
- gtPathways courses primarily about delivering content. Faculty deliver content but may not be equipped to assess all of these competencies and unclear about where the assessments will be done. How will faculty assess these at the course level? Concerned about how manageable the assessment will be.
- One discussant indicated they have been using rubrics and have found them helpful and manageable. Should be able to compress some and clump them together.
- One school assessing 300 sessions – not sustainable if expected to assess for all competencies.
- High concern that some of the criteria are not articulated in ways that are relevant for how historians construct knowledge.
- What needs to be on a syllabus for reviewer to feel confident that competencies are being addressed? Could ask people to address specifically the competencies in a form, matrix, or separate sheet.
- Having these competencies would make institutional assessment easier.
- Will it be an improvement on current competencies? Can we be more discerning about which competencies a particular discipline or course has to take on.
- Whose job is it to help students develop into engaged students? Job is to teach knowledge and understanding but maybe not the actual engagement. Gives you tools of discernment.

Competency 1 Written Communication
Final Conclusion: Should be required

Agreement that writing is critical for history. One person stated most important of all the competencies assigned to history.

Currently required and not a huge change from what is already embedded in current history.

Competency 2 Critical Thinking
Final Conclusion: Would agree that it should remain in History with revisions (see below). Recommend first part of the agenda for fall conference should be to review revisions to this or other competencies.

Support critical thinking but would add or change some definitions. Would want to further refine to reflect context within specific discipline.

Rubrics can be more specific. One person really dislikes the rubric; could re-write rubrics.

Critical thinking is important but don't like the way that it is defined here. Can we suggest revisions?

Can we focus on 5-6 that a group of faculty thinks would be most important ideas for historical thinking?

Need some disciplinary specificity. Want to articulate differences.

The idea that content is nothing more than a vehicle to move towards competencies was disturbing. Can't separate content from competencies.

Students only need 1 history course, so content is subservient to the general competency. Historical method has to be embedded.

Let us define how critical thinking applies to history.

Like the competency of critical thinking, but the learning outcomes are not reflective for history. Needs disciplinary-specific approaches to critical thinking.

Primary concerns are around "creating a personal response." Also some important concepts are missing. Not sure that identifying assumptions is appropriate at this level.

Written communication criteria are stated in terms of relevance to the discipline; why can't critical thinking be?

Is it possible that the other competencies are markers of critical thinking?

Could we change the label "Create a Personal Response" to something like "Create a Specific Response" or something that takes out "personal"

Add Inquiry as an outcome.

As defined, History would reject this. Would accept some pieces, reject others, and find some things missing.

Received some clarification from Ian and Susan. Susan recommended sending feedback in general on the "personal" descriptor. Suggested that the competency be revised to add "within the context of the discipline." Application or use will be reflected in some way by disciplinary context. Important for faculty to feel empowered to make recommendations.

Could we add the disciplinary responsiveness language from written communications to criteria and/or learning outcomes? Use the language similar to the written communications competency.

K-12 standards would be good platform for aligning this.

Focus on inquiry is not in the current competency. It is embedded in problem solving. Not suggesting taking on problem solving. Is there a way to get that into critical thinking.

Could we copy and paste "Define a Problem" into Critical Thinking rubric? Or add "Conduct Disciplinary Inquiry" to list?

Susan thinks that some suggestions revisions could help inform the multi-state initiative. Important to open up a way to make relevant for disciplines.

Suggested Revisions (Very rough draft – those present would be willing to refine via email over the summer)

Criteria for Critical Thinking:
Competency in critical thinking addresses a student's ability to develop questions, analyze information and ideas from multiple perspectives, and articulates a conclusion based on analysis.

Students should be able to:

Conduct Disciplinary Inquiry
- Develop questions to examine a problem or issue
- Identify relevant contextual factor related to the problem
- Gather sources, evidence, or data

Use Context
- Identify assumptions
- Analyze one's own and others' assumptions

Create a Thesis
- Identify a specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) that takes into account the complexities of an issue.
- Synthesize other points of view within their own position.

Incorporate Evidence
- Interpret sources to develop an analysis or synthesis.
- Evaluate sources to develop an analysis or synthesis.

Understand Implications and Make Conclusions
- Establish a conclusion that is tied to the range of information presented.
- Reflect on implications and consequences of stated conclusion.

Competency 3: Civic Engagement
Final conclusion: Make optional

Would like to be an optional one. Would potentially require significant revision of curriculum.

Some concerns with Civic Knowledge as it implies service learning or field experiences that are not currently part of the curriculum will be required. If this could be eliminated and the final one could be explained, one person felt it would be okay with keeping this one required.

One member rejects this category completely. Definition places it outside of disciplinary concern. Focus on participation in activities. Good idea but not a target of teaching. Would hope that it is required for other areas but not relevant for history.

One value of optional is that it allows those who would want to incorporate into courses if they want.

Group could reject it knowing that it is addressed in other content areas.

Competency 4: Information Literacy
==**Final conclusion: Should be required**==

To what extent do we want to or do we currently incorporate research into courses?

This is required in every SS course in one community course.

One is moving away from traditional freshman research paper. Looking at doing building blocks: annotated bib, proposal, outline within 1 course. Helps students work on research skills. This model would work with this competency.

Like this one. This is what we do. This could almost be the critical thinking competency in history.

Competency 5: Oral Communication
==**Final Conclusion: Remove as required or optional competency**==

Most courses are large and are not appropriate venues for oral communication. Not particularly relevant to curriculum.

Fabulous for grad students or teaching candidates. Maybe not for gen ed history.
Why isn't there a specific category for Communication on the gtPathways list of courses if this is important?

Wayne.artis@ppcc.edu
Vicky.bollenbacher@aims.edu
lcalhoun@uccs.edu
fritz.fischer@unco.edu
Geoff.Hunt@ccaurora.edu
klimekk@msudenver.edu
Kelly.long@colosrare.edu
rdloosbr@adams.edu
jared.orsi@colostate.edu
Christopher.Holcom@ccd.edu