

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday October 3, 2019

Time: 3:30-5:00

Location: Rarick Hall 113

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Marcella Marez (AHSS)

Jessica Heronemus (BE)

David Schmidt (BE)

Sarah Broman (Ed)

Phillip Olt (Ed)

Trey Hill (HBS)

Glen McNeil (HBS)

Joe Chretien (STM)

Lanee Young (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Helen Miles (Senate)

Michael Musgrove (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

3:30 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Duffy, McNeil, and Schmidt. Miles was serving as proxy for McNeil, and Marez was serving as proxy for Schmidt. Stephanie Johnson (psychology, virtual college advisor), Jack Maseberg (physics, academic affairs committee), and Kevin Splichal (faculty senate president) were present as guests. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:31 (10 minutes) Chair opened the meeting with a report from the most recent academic affairs committee concerning their further consideration of our proposed policies and procedures for the CORE program. The most consequential messages from them to us were that (1) they really do want us to strike any policy that puts restrictions on course proposals being submitted to satisfy CORE outcomes, and (2) they are open to having details added to clarify the outcomes for Objective 1.1B, Oral Communication.

3:41 (45 minutes) Consideration turned next to a proposal by Hartman, similar to the motion that didn't pass last week, that incorporates the various recommendations from academic affairs and adjusts the proposed CORE policies accordingly. Changes include (1) removing the list of courses identified for inclusion in the CORE program prior to their going through the course approval process (Fundamentals of Oral Communication, Introduction to Computer Information Systems, Critical Thinking, Personal Wellness, etc.), (2) correctly identifying the name of the "Transfer Agreement and Articulation Guide General Education Program," (3) clarifying that the proposed changes to the course approval process add to but do not supplant the existing course approval process, (4) changing the name of the "Faculty Review Panels" to the less threatening "Faculty Advisory Panels," and (5) indicating that the policies and procedures and

the common learning outcomes will be reviewed on alternate years. These changes were approved: 11 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstaining. (See Appendix A.)

4:26 (17 minutes) Marez then proposed an adjustment to the 1.1B outcomes in keeping with the suggestion from the academic affairs committee that this would be acceptable. The language was adjusted slightly, put to a vote, and accepted unanimously. (See Appendix B.)

4:43 (about 10 minutes) Drabkin proposed language requiring that "courses proposed to fulfill outcome 3 for Objective 1.5 [critical thinking] must have a course fulfilling outcomes 1 and 2 for Objective 1.5 as a prerequisite." This passed unanimously, along with a further specification that that this prerequisite be a lower-division course. (See Appendix A.)

4:53 (about 7 minutes) Chair asked committee members to send him any recommendations as soon as possible for answering the questions about the CORE policies and procedures that came from faculty senators at the beginning of last week. (See Appendix C.) The hope would be to get these answers to senate in time for their October meeting, this coming Tuesday October 7, but also for academic affairs, if they are ready, to present their recommendation on the CORE policies and procedures at this meeting as well. Splichal suggested, however, that it would be best not to put this to a vote at the October meeting, but for senators to be given another month to talk over the details with their departments. The senate vote would then come in November.

5:00ish Meeting ended. The committee will next meet at 3:30 PM on Thursday October 9 in Rarick 113.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary



Appendix A:

FHSU CORE Program Policies and Procedures

Approved by the General Education Committee, 3/28/19, 4/4/19, and 10/3/19

Seeking approval of Academic Affairs Committee

Not yet submitted to Faculty Senate

DEFINITIONS:

- **COMMON LEARNING OUTCOMES:** a term used by the Higher Learning Commission, FHSU's accrediting body, to identify the measurable general-education achievements attained by graduates of an institution
- **GOAL:** an achievement attained by meeting objectives
- **OBJECTIVE:** a benchmark all students are expected to achieve
- **OUTCOME SET:** a group of common learning outcomes organized under an objective, typically fulfilled by a specific course.

- RUBRIC: a document identifying the standards for proficiency used in assessing the level of student achievement of particular outcomes
- MODE OF INQUIRY COURSE: an FHSU CORE course that fulfills the outcome-set for one of the six Modes of Inquiry identified under objective 2.1
- GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE: the Provost's committee that oversees FHSU general-education programs and makes recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee

GENERAL POLICIES:

- As part of the University's commitment to academic excellence, the General Education Committee will review (1) its administrative policies and procedures and (2) the common learning outcomes on alternate years. These reviews will engage faculty, administrators, students, and other stakeholders. The results of the reviews and any recommendations for change will be approved by Faculty Senate.
- Candidates for bachelor's degrees are required to fulfill all FHSU CORE common learning outcomes, unless they qualify for the Transfer Agreement and Articulation Guide General Education Program, the Bachelor of General Studies General Education Program, or the International Partnerships General Education Program.
- FHSU CORE common learning outcomes are fulfilled by successful completion of approved courses.
- Outcome 2.1-D.3 (Natural Scientific Mode of Inquiry) must be satisfied by a lab or field course of at least 1 credit hour in addition to and separate from the course that satisfies outcomes 1 and 2 of Objective 2.1-D.
- Outcomes for Objective 1.4, Information Literacy, are to be fulfilled by a sophomore or junior level course—ideally, but not necessarily, from the student's major program of study.
- Outcomes 1 and 2 for Objective 1.5 are to be fulfilled by a lower-division course.
- Outcomes for Objective 1.1-A and outcome 3 for Objective 1.5 (discipline-specific criticism of the student's own reasoning) are to be fulfilled by an upper-division course—ideally, but not necessarily, at the senior level from the student's major program of study.
- Courses proposed to fulfill outcome set 1.1-A must have ENG 101 English Composition I and ENG 102 English Composition II as prerequisites.
- Courses proposed to fulfill outcome 3 for Objective 1.5 must have a course fulfilling outcomes 1 and 2 for Objective 1.5 as a prerequisite.

POLICIES FOR ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES:

- Because the Higher Learning Commission—the accrediting body for Fort Hays State University—requires the University to report student achievement of Common Learning Outcomes, student achievement for each FHSU CORE learning outcome must be assessed and reported to the office of Institutional Effectiveness and Quality Improvement.
- Each course designated as satisfying FHSU CORE outcomes must have specified the assignment whereby students will demonstrate their proficiency with the outcomes satisfied by the course. Additionally, each course must have specified a rubric whereby faculty can measure student achievement on each relevant outcome.

- All faculty teaching courses that fulfill FHSU CORE Outcomes will use the rubric submitted with their course to measure the outcome achievement of each student completing the course with a passing grade.
- Faculty will be able to enter assessment data at any point in the semester. The deadline for faculty to report FHSU CORE Assessment Data will be 48 hours after the deadline to report final grades for the semester.
- Two courses—ENG 101 English Composition I and ENG 102 English Composition II—contribute to, but do not ultimately fulfill FHSU CORE Learning Outcomes. Assessment for these courses will continue to use the established biennial pre- and post-test writing assessment and Paired T-Test statistical analysis to measure student progress toward the relevant outcomes.

TENTATIVE PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSMENT OF FHSU CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES:

- *Currently, FHSU is reviewing assessment-reporting systems. That review will directly determine the procedure for reporting assessment data. Procedures for reporting assessment data will be developed after the review is complete.*

POLICIES FOR COURSE APPROVAL:

NOTE: These Course Approval Policies address only the portion of the University Course Approval Procedure that applies to submissions to the General Education Committee for courses to be included in the General Education Program. These policies have no impact on other stages of the Course Approval Process.

- FHSU CORE course proposals must include the specific assignment used to measure student achievement of each learning outcome within the FHSU CORE outcome set. Proposals must also include the rubric used to assess student achievement on the applicable CORE outcomes.
- A department is limited to offering courses that satisfy outcomes sets from no more than 2 Modes of Inquiry. Exceptions to this policy can be granted to departments that are conjoined, multidisciplinary units.
- A course can fulfill more than one outcome set. However, no course will be certified to fulfill the outcome sets for more than one Mode of Inquiry.
- Courses that satisfy requirements for the FHSU CORE can also satisfy degree-program requirements.
- Proposals for courses fulfilling outcome sets will be reviewed by Faculty Advisory Panels. Panels will advise the General Education Committee as to whether proposed assignments demonstrate students' fulfillment of outcomes. Like other stages in the FHSU Course Approval Process, the Faculty Advisory Panel will submit a review letter to the General Education Committee. Where necessary, review letters should specify revisions that would improve the course proposal.
- Faculty Advisory Panels will be made up of no fewer than three faculty members, appointed by and reporting to the General Education Committee. Faculty Advisory Panel members will be nominated by FHSU Deans of divisions relevant to the particular outcome set.
- Faculty Advisory Panels will be available to work with faculty and departments on the development of assignments and rubrics, and to give clarification and guidance for revision and development of FHSU CORE course proposals.

PROCEDURE FOR COURSE APPROVAL:

- When a department seeks approval for a course to fulfill a CORE outcome set, the department initiates a Workday Course Event process (or Lotus Notes Course Approval process), either as “Edit Course” or as “Create Course.” The Course Event process will include the assignments and rubric described in the Policies for Course Approval.
- The Director of General Education will direct the proposal to the appropriate Faculty Advisory Panel.
- The Faculty Advisory Panel can advise the department on revisions or improvements and will generate a review letter to be submitted to the General Education Committee.
- In accordance with current policy and procedure, the General Education Committee will review the proposal and generate a review letter for the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee.
- In accordance with current policy and procedure, the General Education Committee has no authority to reject a proposed course. If the General Education Committee determines that a proposed course is in some way deficient or otherwise not worthy of a positive review, the General Education Committee is expected to advise the department on how the proposal ought to be revised in order to receive a more favorable review from the General Education Committee.

Appendix B:

Revision to FHSU CORE Outcomes

Approved by General Education Committee 10/3/19

Submitted for approval by Academic Affairs Committee

CURRENT:

Outcomes 1.1-B: Oral Communication

By graduation, students will ...

1. Present orally an original message that effectively addresses an assigned purpose;
2. Present orally an original message that effectively addresses a specified audience;
3. Demonstrate effective critical listening.

REVISED:

Outcomes 1.1-B: Oral Communication

By graduation, students will ...

1. Present orally an original message that effectively addresses an assigned purpose;
2. Present orally an original message that effectively addresses a specified audience;
3. Present orally an original message that effectively demonstrates appropriate vocal variety that achieves congruence with and enhancement of verbal intent;
4. Present orally an original message that demonstrates nonverbal behavior that effectively supports the verbal message during an oral presentation;
5. Present orally an original message that demonstrates their ability to locate and select appropriate support based on the topic, audience, setting, and purpose;
6. Demonstrate effective critical listening;
7. Effectively review and critique a peer speaker’s purpose and organization of ideas and information.

Appendix C:

SENATE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CORE PROGRAM AND POLICIES 9/23/19

Terminology Questions:

Are the "FHSU CORE assessment rubric" and the assessment rubric developed by the department and approved by the faculty review panel the same thing?

When the policies make reference to "sophomore," "junior," "upper-level" or "senior-level" courses, how are these terms to be understood?

Are the "Transfer Agreement and Articulation Guide" and the "transfer and articulation general education program" the same thing?

If "CORE" stands for "core outcomes for relevant education," do we really want to say "CORE outcomes" (outcomes outcomes)?

Implications for Major Programs:

Will departments have to change the outcomes of their major courses if they want to have them satisfy CORE outcomes?

Why restrict different sections of the same course from developing different assignments with different rubrics?

Will restricting departments to using the same assignments and rubrics for a given outcome set not discourage innovation?

Faculty Review Panels and the Approval Process:

Who decides which courses get approved?

Who will be appointed to the faculty review panels?

How do we know that the faculty review panels will understand proposals coming from departments outside their respective areas of expertise?

Should there not be a representative from each of the five colleges on each of the faculty review panels?

Will there be an opportunity to appeal the recommendations of the faculty review panels?

How will approval decisions get made?

Pre-Identified Courses:

What is the justification for the list of pre-identified CORE courses (the third bullet point under General Policies)?

Modes of Inquiry:

Why can one course not satisfy the outcome set for more than one mode of inquiry?

Can an exemption for multidisciplinary departments not be given to allow the offering of courses in more than two modes of inquiry?

Assessment Data:

Must assessment data be provided for courses in the major satisfying CORE outcomes?

How will rubric assessment data be entered?

When will faculty be able to enter CORE assessment data?

Is it appropriate to specify when the assessment data is due if we don't know how the data will be entered?

Will entering assessment data be inappropriately burdensome for faculty, particularly at the end of semesters?

Policy Changes in the Future:

What will the process be for changing CORE policies?

Timeline:

What is the timeline for launching the CORE program?

In the initial round of course proposals, will there be a cut-off date after which new courses will not be considered?

The Big Question:

What is the justification for the extent of the changes to the current general education program?