FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday November 5, 2020

Time: 3:30-5:00

Location: https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/94675596647

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)
Lanee Young (STM)
Robyn Hartman (Lib)
Helen Miles (Senate)
Isaiah Schindler (SGA)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)
Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

3:30? (1 minute?) All members were present with the exception of Drabkin and Miller. (Drabkin arrived late.) Determined that a quorum was met.

3:31? (1 minute?) The minutes from October 29 were approved.

3:32? (33 minutes?) Two proposals for CORE courses were up for consideration this week: GSCI 100: Introduction to Geology for outcomes 2.1D.1-2 (the first two of the natural scientific mode of inquiry outcomes) and GSCI 102: Introduction to Geology Laboratory for outcome 2.1D.3 (the third natural scientific mode of inquiry outcome). In the end, both were ***tabled***, as there appeared to be a significant disconnect between the the three outcomes as we understand them and how they are being handled in the two courses being proposed. Outcome 2.1D.1, for instance, requires students to "identify essential characteristics of natural scientific questions (questions of empirical study and application of scientific methodologies)." What it means to identify a thing's essential characteristics is to recognize and pick out its defining properties (necessary and sufficient conditions). We have decided that these characteristics involve "empirical study and application of scientific methodologies." We expect any assessment of 2.1D.1, therefore, to be an assessment of the student's ability to identify this. (How many characteristics we are talking about here, and what they are exactly, is unclear.) The committee decided that Chair and Olt will attempt to meet with Grady Dixon (Dean of the College of Science, Technology, and Mathematics) and Gavin Buffington (Physics) to see if they can't put together a example of a 2.1D course with assignments and rubrics that can serve as a paradigm for departments proposing 2.1D

courses for the CORE program. The committee had met with Buffington on October 15 about a similar disconnect between the 2.1D outcomes and the Elementary Meteorology course, and he seemed to have had an idea of what needs to be done.

4:05 (10 minutes) Glenn asked for clarification concerning the three upper-level writing outcomes (1.1A.1-2 and 1.5.3). It was confirmed that, for each major program, these three outcomes are to be met in a single course.

4:15 (18 minutes) Young asked for advice on where, if anywhere, MATH 250: Elements of Statistics belongs in the CORE program. The answer depends on which outcomes it can do a good job of satisfying. If, like the mathematics courses we have already approved for the CORE program, it can satisfy the outcomes for 1.2 (quantitative literacy) and 2.1C (mathematical mode of inquiry), then it would go there. This led to a broader discussion reminding committee members that the CORE program seriously blurs the line between "major courses" and "GenEd courses," and that the number of course hours outside of the major that students will be required to take to complete the CORE program will depend on how they make their way through the program.

4:33 Meeting ended. Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday November 12.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary