

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday May 6, 2021

Time: 3:30-5:00

Location: <https://fhsu.zoom.us/j/93003453531>

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)
Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)
Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

-
- 3:31 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Marez and Schindler. Young served as proxy for Marez. Determined that a quorum was met.
- 3:32 (1 minute) The minutes from the April 22 meeting were approved.
- 3:33 (1 minute) Rob Channell of the Department of Biological Sciences was appointed to replace Brian Maricle on the natural sciences mode of inquiry faculty advisory panel.
- 3:34 (6 minutes) As a follow-up to our unofficial meeting last Thursday, Chair informed the committee (1) that Academic Council has decided to table the proposed changes to the Transfer Agreement General Education Program, and (2) that the Provost has decided that it will be up to each department whether the university will accept StraighterLine online courses for FHSU credit for courses under the department's purview.
- 3:40 (2 minutes) The committee considered an amended proposal for **PHIL 170: World Religions** to satisfy the 2.1E outcomes (philosophical mode of inquiry). The proposal was *approved*.
- 3:42 (1 minute) The committee considered an amended proposal for **PHIL 201: Political Philosophy** to satisfy the 2.1E outcomes (philosophical mode of inquiry). The proposal was *approved*.

3:43 (1 minute) The committee considered an amended proposal for **PHIL 340: Ethics** to satisfy the 2.1E outcomes (philosophical mode of inquiry). The proposal was **approved**.

3:44 (15 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **LDRS 650: Principles of Organizational Leadership** to satisfy the 1.1A and 1.5.3 outcomes (senior-level writing and critical thinking). The proposal was **approved contingent** upon two changes being made: (1) that grading percentages from the student-facing rubric be replaced on the CORE rubric by descriptive language for each level of proficiency, and (2) that the language on the rubric for 1.5.3 more explicitly reference subjecting of the student's own reasoning to sustained, intelligent criticism (e.g., "alternative perspectives are identified, analyzed, and addressed").

3:59 (7 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **NURS 431L: Capstone** to satisfy the 1.1A and 1.5.3 outcomes (senior-level writing and critical thinking). In an a decision that was **reversed** later in the meeting (see 4:35 below), the committee decided to **table** the proposal and ask the department to make changes in keeping with the points 2 and 3 in the recommendations from the faculty advisory panel.

4:06 (29 minutes) The committee considered a proposal for **MUS 684** to satisfy the 1.1A and 1.5.3 outcomes (senior-level writing and critical thinking). One question that immediately arose was whether the title of the course is to be "Organ Literature," "Music Literature," or simply "Literature." Chair will look into this. The committee voted, all but one in favor, to **approve** the course **contingent** upon a change being made to the language on the rubric for 1.5.3 ("subject the student's reasoning to sustained, intelligent criticism"): the proficiency descriptions should explicitly measure the student's ability to identify, analyze, and address reasoning in opposition to their own reasoning.

4:35 (15 minutes) The committee revisited **NURS 431L** (see 3:59 above) and decided to **approve** the course **contingent** upon changes being made to the CORE rubric in keeping with the following recommendations from the faculty advisory panel:

Where the rubric reads, "Provides adequate summary of a problem in healthcare with supporting evidence. Issues related to the problem adequately developed with contrary views or potential change issues explained," it would be good to specify that the "supporting evidence" is in support of the *change* recommended, not just the problem—and that the contrary views relate to the *change* recommended as well. Something like this might be more clear: "Provides adequate summary of a problem in healthcare, proposes change(s) to address that problem, and includes evidence supporting said change(s). Issues related to the problem are adequately developed, and contrary views toward the problem and the proposed change issues are explained and addressed." As a minor point, we recommend dropping the references at the bottom to specific sections of the student-facing rubric. (The CORE rubric should be a stand-alone document.)

This passed, again with only one vote in opposition. Against approving this proposal (and the proposal for MUS 684 -- it was the same point), Duffy argued that outcome 1.1A.2 ("produce a discipline-specific document judged proficient according to a department-approved rubric in the student's major") should be interpreted for most but not all disciplines to exclude traditional academic writing addressed to a learned audience; her point was that it would be good for our students to be trained in writing that "they might do in their career."

4:50 Meeting ended. Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 13.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

