

# FHSU General Education Committee

---

## Minutes

### Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

**Date:** Thursday September 17, 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)

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. Duffy served as proxy for Miller. Faculty Senate President Kevin Splichal, and Department of History members Kim Perez and Paul Nienkamp were also in attendance. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:31 (3 minutes) The minutes from last week's meeting were approved unanimously.

3:32 (2 minutes) The committee noted that the proposal for CRJ 360: Social Justice to satisfy the 2.1F outcomes (social scientific mode of inquiry) has been amended: (1) the specific assignment to assess each outcome is now indicated on the rubric (sort of), (2) the CORE rubric descriptions now more fully indicate what the evaluator will be looking for in the student's performance, and (3) the CORE outcomes appear on the syllabus. The course was **approved** unanimously.

3:34 (6 minutes) The committee noted that the proposal for CRJ 499: Capstone Seminar in Criminal Justice to satisfy the outcomes for the three upper-division writing-related outcomes (1.1A.1, 1.1A.2, and 1.5.3) has been amended to take into consider the recommendations of the Writing Across the Curriculum committee. The course was **approved**: 13 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstaining.

3:40 (5 minutes) The committee noted that the proposal for SOC 145: Cultural Anthropology to satisfy the 3.2 outcomes (intercultural competence) has been amended: (1) the meaning of the term "scholarly research" has been

clarified, (2) the aspects of culture the student is required to analyze has been specified, and (3) the proficiency standards in the rubric has been brought in line with the assessment assignment. With the understanding that the final word "community" will be added to the rubric in the statement of outcome 3.2.3, the course was **approved** unanimously.

3:45 (3 minutes) The committee noted that similar changes were made to the proposal for SOC 376: U.S. Racial and Ethnic Groups to satisfy the 3.2 outcomes as were made to the proposal for SOC 145. With the understanding that the final word "community" will be added to the rubric in the statement of outcome 3.2.3, the course was **approved**, but not unanimously this time; one person abstained.

3:48 (23 minutes) Attention turned next to HIST 379: Historical Methods, proposed to satisfy two outcome sets: 1.4 (information literacy) and 1.5.1-2 (critical thinking, lower-division). After discussion with the committee, the History Department agreed to revise the rubric for 1.4, but to withdraw the course from consideration for 1.5.1-2. They will meet with members of the committee (Hartman, Chair, or both of them) about revising the 1.4 rubric. The committee voted unanimously to **table** consideration of the proposal.

4:11 (18 minutes) Next was a proposal for HIST 675: Seminar in History to satisfy the outcomes for the three upper-division writing-related outcomes (1.1A.1, 1.1A.2, and 1.5.3). The committee asked that the CORE rubric be revised so that it doesn't reference the HMSR rubric, but instead captures, in the boxes of the CORE rubric, what it is for the student to achieve each proficiency level. In particular, the committee recommended that the things taken up under "counter evidence" in the HMSR rubric be isolated for the 1.5.3 row of the CORE rubric. It was decided unanimously to **table** consideration of the proposal.

4:29 (3 minutes) Hartman, who serves on the faculty development committee, suggested that it would be a good idea for us to propose workshops of some sort to help departments prepare their CORE course proposals.

4:32 (1 minute) Miles informed the committee that the Academic Affairs committee is going to meet soon to give further consideration to courses we have recently approved.

4:33 (5 minutes) Chair asked the committee in what respects if any he should serve as "gatekeeper" for proposals coming to the committee. The committee recommended that pointing out obvious things that will expedite our work would be helpful, for instance, pointing out when an application is incomplete or fails to follow the CORE policies and procedures.

4:38 (3 minutes) Drabkin noted that there are significant problems in one of the rubrics we have recently approved, and that we might do well to point these problems out to the department that intends to put this rubric into use. McNeil observed that departments will have opportunities in the future to fix assignments and rubrics that don't work well. Chair observed that we don't have a lot of experience at our university doing outcomes-based assessment. We are like middle-aged people who have never learned to drive. (The key is in the ignition. Let's give "R" a try.)

4:41 Meeting ended. Our next meeting is scheduled for Thursday September 24 in cyberspace.

---

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

