

FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

Date: Thursday March 18, 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)

3:32 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Chretien, Marez, McNeil, and Schindler. Smith served as proxy for Marez, and Miles served as proxy for McNeil. The committee was joined by two members of the Department of Leadership Studies: Kaley Klaus, and Brett Whitaker (chair). Determined that a quorum was met.

3:33 (1 minute) The minutes from last week's meeting were amended and approved.

3:34 (33 minutes) The committee began by speaking with Kaley Klaus and Brett Whitaker about details in the assignments and CORE rubric for **IDS 407: Global Challenges**, which is being proposed to satisfy the 3.3 outcomes (engaged global citizens). The committee asked that a single magazine article be identified for assessing outcome 1, and again, a single magazine article for assessing outcome 2 (not a composite average over multiple assignments), and that, regarding outcome 2 ("analyze a complex boundary-spanning issue, taking into account the various perspectives of those involved"), that the proficiency descriptions be tied to analysis of a particular issue, not description of multiple issues, which is the focus of outcome 1. It was suggested that a modification of line 3 from the student-facing "Magazine Article Grading Rubric" might be a good place to start in working up this change. Regarding outcome 3, the committee noticed an ambiguity in the language of the outcome: "*The student will design a project in cooperation with others that addresses a complex boundary-spanning issue.*" The committee of 2018 who agreed on the wording for 3.3.3 intended the outcome to mean: (1) *The student will design a project that addresses a complex boundary-spanning issue, and they will design this project in cooperation with others.* The department, however, understood the outcome to mean: (2) *The student will design a project that addresses a complex boundary-spanning issue, and the project will*

take into account the people who would need to cooperate in this imagined project. Although this alternative interpretation was not what the founders of the constitution intended, we are not judicial originalists, it would seem, and the committee judged (2) to be reasonable. The committee voted to **approve** the course **contingent upon** the identified rubric changes being made. We asked to look at the changes as a committee before passing the proposal on to Academic Affairs.

4:07 Next was **GSCI 240: Introduction to Geographic Information Systems** which is being proposed to satisfy the 1.3 outcomes (computing literacy). Schmidt, speaking for the 1.3 faculty advisory panel, reported that outcomes 1 ("effectively perform data analysis using appropriate technology such as spreadsheets and database applications") and 5 ("identify the ethical and legal standards of conduct regarding the use of data and technology") are handled well, but that they had questions about the other three. Regarding outcome 2 ("effectively format documents such as reports, essays, or resumes using appropriate technology"), it's not clear what formatting standards are being used. This could be specified on the syllabus, or on the student-facing rubric. Regarding outcome 4 ("successfully perform a task with others using collaborative technology") -- which Drabkin snarkily noted is also ambiguous between two sharply different meanings -- it's not clear what collaborative technology would be used or how it would be applied. Regarding outcome 3 ("design effective presentations using appropriate technology") the faculty advisory panel asks us what should count as a "presentation"? The committee voted to **table** the proposal. Chair will speak with Todd Moore, chair of Geosciences, about our concerns regarding outcomes 2 and 4. And another motion passed asking the department to clarify what the presentation for outcome 3 would look like.

4:30? Next was **LDRS 460: Global Leadership**, which is being proposed for two outcome sets: 2.1F (social scientific mode of inquiry) and 3.2 (intercultural competence). Re. 2.1F, the faculty advisory panel pronounced succinctly that they are "comfortable with the course moving forward." But the committee was less than comfortable. Where in this course is the social scientific mode of inquiry being taught -- the frameworks for explaining social phenomena, and when they are and are or are not applicable (2.1F.1); and the merits of good social scientific research, with respect to factors such as sample size, study design, and validity (2.1F.2)? And regarding 2.1F.3 ("compare and contrast human behavior among various cultures using social science concepts"), there appears to be a disconnect between the assessment method and the rubric; but perhaps this is just another example of the relevant parts of a student-facing rubric needing to be imported into the CORE rubric (while leaving out the irrelevant parts, such as grammar). Re. 3.2, the committee noted a clear disconnect between outcome 1 ("produce an exploratory or investigative work based upon a personal interaction such as a conversation, an interview, or a service-learning experience that compares and contrasts the culture of an individual or group outside of the student's own identity community with the student's own culture") and the assignment being proposed to assess it (the "Cultural Intelligence Assessment Reflection Paper"), which is not based on a personal interaction with someone outside the student's identity community. The committee voted to **table** the proposal for both outcome sets, and lamented losing the opportunity earlier in the meeting for speaking about this course with members of the department.

4:50? Chair suggested that we spend time over *Spring Break* preparing to discuss nine courses being proposed to satisfy the 2.1D outcomes (natural scientific mode of inquiry): BIOL 100: Human Biology; BIOL 102: Laboratory Experiences in Biology; BIOL 200: Humans and the Environment; BIOL 300: Human Heredity; GSCI 100: Introduction to Geology; GSCI 101: Elements of Physical Geography; GSCI 102: Introduction to Geology Laboratory; GSCI 340: Environmental Geology; and PHYS 208: Elementary Meteorology. These files are all in the "Fall 2020" folder, which is in the "Course Proposals" folder, which is in the "General Education Committee" folder, which is on the N-drive. The committee decided to split the workload for this task. Some of us will focus on the four BIOL courses, some of us will focus on the four GSCI courses, and we will all focus on the PHYS course. But we should all come to the next meeting with a working familiarity with all nine proposals. Remember that, according to CORE policy, 2.1D must be assessed in two separate courses, the first two outcomes in one course, and the third in another.

4:59 Meeting ended. Our next meeting is scheduled for next Thursday, April 1.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

