

# FHSU General Education Committee

---

## Minutes

### Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

**Date:** Thursday August 27, 2020

**Time:** 3:30-5:00

**Location:** cyberspace

### Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)  
Marcella Marez (AHSS)  
Christina Glenn (BE)  
David Schmidt (BE)  
Sarah Broman Miller (Ed)  
Phillip Olt (Ed)  
Glen McNeil (HBS)  
Denise Orth (HBS)  
Joe Chretien (STM)  
Lane Young (STM)  
Robyn Hartman (Lib)  
Helen Miles (Senate)  
Isaiah Schindler (SGA, not yet officially)  
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)  
Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

---

3:30 (1 minute) All members were present. Timothy Rolls (music) was also in attendance. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:32 (31 minutes) Attention first turned to the proposal for accepting MUS 161: Listening to Music into the CORE program as satisfying outcome set 2.1A: Knowledge of the Liberal Arts: Aesthetic Mode of Inquiry. Although the committee, in the end, voted unanimously to accept the proposal, it gave us pause due to two things being unclear: (1) how the "evaluation rubrics" for outcomes 2 and 3 relate to the corresponding rows of the CORE rubric, and (2) what exactly the faculty advisory panel is thinking when they write "it would be helpful if the indicators on all rubrics have the same number of incidences of success within each level of achievement." Chair will contact the faculty advisory panel and ask that they explain what they are thinking more fully in the future.

4:03 (20 minutes) Attention turned next to the proposal for accepting MUS 391: Jazz into the CORE program, again for the outcome set 2.1A. Here too, it wasn't clear what the faculty advisory panel is recommending when they write, for instance, that "the assignments need to share the same outcomes and the indicators within each level of achievement ought to align." That cloudiness aside, the committee voted unanimously not to accept the proposal for a different reason: an apparent disconnect between the proposed CORE assignments and rubrics on the one hand and the proposed syllabus on the other. It wasn't clear, in other words, how the CORE assessments are to be integrated into the course. The Department of Music will be asked to make adjustments to the syllabus.

4:23 (7 minutes) The third and final item of business concerned which faculty members will constitute the advisory panel for outcome 1.5.3: "produce a written document on a difficult question involving the disciplinary content of the student's major that subjects the student's reasoning to sustained, intelligent criticism according to the standards of that discipline." Three candidates for this task were proposed: (1) the persons nominated by the deans last winter to serve in this capacity; (2) the persons currently tasked with advising us on proposals to satisfy the two other critical thinking outcomes, 1.5.1 and 1.5.2; or (3) the persons currently tasked with advising us on proposals to satisfy the two other upper-level writing outcomes, 1.1A.1 and 1.1A.2. The committee chose (3): the members of the university's Writing Across the Curriculum committee. This may streamline our approval process a bit, as most departments are likely to handle outcomes 1.1A.1, 1.1A.2, and 1.5.3 in the same course. (Note: We set up the faculty advisory panels back in February, but our records are unclear on what we finally decided in this particular case. There was no sense at this week's meeting that our decision was an undoing or revision of anything we had settled on before. It's just that we had lost track of what, if anything, we had decided back then.)

4:30 Meeting ended. Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday September 3 in cyberspace.

---

**Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary**

