

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday March 5, 2020

Time: 3:30-5:00

Location: Rarick Hall 113

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Marcella Marez (AHSS)

Jessica Heronemus (BE)

David Schmidt (BE)

Sarah Broman Miller (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 Chretien, Miller, Schmidt, and Smith. Christina Glenn (Economics, Finance, and Accounting), Stephanie Johnson (Psychology), Micki Armstrong (Sociology), Isaiah Schindler (Student Government Association), and Dosse Toulaboe (Economics, Finance, and Accounting) were also in attendance. Heronemus served as proxy for Smith, McNeil served as proxy for Schmidt, and Olt served as proxy for Miller. Determined that a quorum was met. Brett Whitaker (Leadership Studies) joined the meeting at 4:20.

3:31 (6 minutes) Heronemus raised a question that bears most directly on outcome 3.3.3 ("design a project in cooperation with others that addresses a complex, boundary-spanning issue") but could be relevant to other outcomes in the CORE program as well. Can a group of students working together on a project be assessed collectively, all receiving the same proficiency rating? This was only briefly discussed, and nothing was put to a vote, but the committee's recommendation (non-binding answer) is no -- students should be individually assessed for their collective work.

3:37 (4 minutes) The committee looked at the revised proposal from Health and Human Performance for **HHP 200: Personal Wellness** to satisfy the outcomes for **Objective 3.1A: Dimensions of Wellness**. The committee noted that the rubric had been changed so that there is one and only one row of descriptions for each outcome, and voted to approve the course. It was also noted, however, that the use of the word "efficiency" in the rubric, in phrases such as "the student has identified with 80-89% efficiency how personal behavior impacts wellness" is sort of weird. Chair will speak with Anita Walters about perhaps changing the word to make what the rubric is saying clearer.

3:41 (27 minutes) Attention turned next to the revised proposal from Economics, Finance, and Accounting for **FIN 205: Theory and Practice of Personal Finance** to satisfy the outcomes for **Objective 3.1B: Financial Health**. The committee noted that the assessment tool had been significantly changed to require students to formulate a financial plan as called for by the outcomes. Discussion turned to the proposed proficiency standard for 3.1B.2, that students "mostly address" a series of questions --

How will you [be] able to incorporate goals into your cash flow and net worth? Did anything surprise you from your cash flow or net worth that caused you to alter your goals? What insights did you learn about your financial habits? What changes do you need to make to successfully manage your money? What tools will assist you with this process? What have you learned that will be beneficial in creating future financial statements for yourself?

-- in a "somewhat organized" way. Christina Glenn suggested that the vagueness of this standard is due to the unpredictability of the individual student's financial situation. It was decided in discussion that the assessment would perhaps be more valuable if students were asked to analyze and plan for, not their actual, present financial health, but for their financial health understood in a hypothetical way, through a case study. This would allow the instructor to specify variables and set up complex situations that would allow for a better engagement with the course material and a more reliable assessment of the student's thinking. The committee voted to approve the course, contingent upon basing the assessment assignment on a case study. The committee did not return to the question of the problematically vague wording of the proficiency standard for 3.1B.2 ("mostly addresses" the questions), which still stands in the rubric as approved.

4:08 (11 minutes) Next was a proposal from Philosophy for **PHIL 100: Critical Thinking** to satisfy **Outcomes 1 and 2 for Objective 1.5: Critical Thinking**. The committee voted to approve the course, but asked that the course syllabus be brought in line with the university's official syllabus template before being sent on to academic affairs.

4:19 (14 minutes) Next was consideration of a proposal from Leadership Studies for **LDRS 200: Discovering Leadership** to satisfy the outcomes **Objective 2.1F: Knowledge of the Liberal Arts -- Social Science Mode of Inquiry**. The faculty advisory panel had judged the rubric to be unacceptably vague, and the department needed more time to reply to this judgment, so the committee decided to table consideration of the proposal. The committee recommended that all the parts of the proposal be submitted in pdf form, and that they not require following external hyperlinks.

4:33 (10 minutes) Young shared some problems Mathematics is encountering in thinking through how they will handle the information literacy outcomes (1.4.1-3) and the three writing-in-the-major outcomes (1.1A.1-2, and 1.5.3). The only upper-level course that all math majors take is MATH 675: Seminar in Mathematics. But it is only a one hour course. Could it serve for all these outcomes? The committee noted that our policies require that the 1.4 outcomes be achieved in "a sophomore or junior level course," so MATH 675 would not work for that. And it seemed doubtful that 1.1A.1-2 and 1.5.3 could be handled adequately in a one hour course. It was suggested that Mathematics might consider (1) having their teaching emphasis students (roughly half of their majors) do 1.4 in a dedicated education course at the sophomore or junior level and that the other math majors take the generic UNIV information literacy course being designed by Library faculty, and (2) expanding MATH 675 to a full three hour course.

4:52 (6 minutes) The committee was asked to make a recommendation for the university's policy requiring all students to take an upper-division integrative IDS course. This will be taken up next week.

4:58 (2 minutes) Hartman reported that the faculty development committee would like the opinion of the general education committee on whether Nicole Frank (TILT) should be contacted about setting up faculty workshops on the topic of rubric reliability (rubric design that results in different evaluators that use the same rubric making the same assessment of the same work). The committee's opinion was yes -- Frank should be contacted about setting this up.

5:00 Meeting ended. The next meeting is scheduled for 3:30 PM on Thursday March 12 in Rarick 113.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

