

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday March 31, 2022

Time: 4:00-5:00

Location: Pioneer Room, and
<https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/94468542828>

Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Marcella Marez (AHSS)

Christina Glenn (BE)

David Schmidt (BE)

Sarah Broman Miller (Ed)

Phillip Olt (Ed)

Denise Orth (HBS)

Tanya Smith (HBS)

C.D. Clark (STM)

Lanee Young (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Rob Byer (Senate)

Mark Faber (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

3:34 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Miller, Orth, and Stanley. Schmidt served as proxy for Miller, and Marez served as proxy for Orth. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:35 (1 minute) The minutes from last week's meeting were approved.

3:36 (1 minute) Chair informed the committee that the Sociology and Social Work departments agreed to our suggested amendments to the CORE rubric for **SOC 362/SOCW 362: Methods of Social Research**, which has been proposed to satisfy the **1.4 outcomes (information literacy)**. This proposal, having been approved last week contingent on these changes being made, moves on to the Academic Affairs committee.

3:37 (30 minutes) Byer passed on a request from some members of Academic Affairs that we provide a letter for each of the courses we approve or deny approval that details our reasoning. The CORE program policies and procedures do require us to provide a "review letter" for each proposal, so this is something we are arguably required to do. And it is likely to bring some clarity to their discussions, a welcome thing. So we basically agreed to do this, even if it results in a somewhat slower flow of courses through our part of the plumbing. With an eye to doing a good job generating these letters, we decided to stop approving courses contingently on changes being made, something we started doing to expedite the process. Every proposal will now return to the full committee, we will take the time to determine the strengths and weaknesses of each

proposal, we will document how we are weighing the various elements, and we will explain how we came to each decision.

4:07 (25 minutes) We considered a revision to the proposal for **TEEL 340: Classroom Management** to satisfy the **3.2 outcomes (intercultural competence)**. We noted that the CORE outcomes were not on the syllabus, a simple fix; and that there is no explicit reference to elucidating multiple aspects of a culture outside of the student's own identify community, another simple fix. This course was not approved contingent on these changes being made (see 3:37), but **tabled**.

4:32 (7 minutes) We turned to **CHEM 100: The Chemist's View of the World**, which is being proposed for **outcomes 2.1D.1-2 (natural scientific mode of inquiry, first two outcomes)**. The course is clearly a good fit for the outcomes, but the assessment is a merging of two separate assessments being made at different times in the semester, something which we're telling people not to do. The committee recommends that the department go with the "Informed Citizen's Look at Chemical Research" project, an assessment that seems tailor-made for these two outcomes. The proposal was **tabled**.

4:39 (6 minutes) Next was **CHEM 105: Introduction to Chemistry Lab**, which is being proposed for **outcome 2.1D.3 (natural scientific mode of inquiry, third outcome)**. The committee noted three problems with the proposal: (1) it is not a single assessment, but a compilation of the student's work over the course of the semester; (2) it includes things in the assessment like a penalty for late work that has no bearing on the outcome being assessed; and (3) it needs to provide an example of the sort of assignment that would be used to make the assessment. The proposal was **tabled**.

4:45 (10 minutes?) The last course considered was **NURS 429: Community Nursing** for **3.2 (intercultural competence)**. The committee noted two problems with the CORE rubric: (1) the phrase "demonstrates . . . understanding of the client's view" in the 3.2.1 row should be something like "articulates the client's view" or "put into words the client's view"; and (2) elucidating multiple aspect of the culture needs to be worked into the 3.2.2 row. The proposal was **tabled**.

4:55? Meeting ended. Our next meeting will be on Thursday April 7 at 3:30 PM.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

