

# FHSU General Education Committee

---

## Minutes

### Meeting Called by

Bradley Will, Chair

**Date:** Thursday January 31, 2019

**Time:** 3:30-5:00

**Location:** Smoky Hill Room, Memorial Union

### Members

Douglas Drabkin (AHSS)

Marcella Marez (AHSS)

Jessica Heronemus (BE)

David Schmidt (BE)

Sarah Broman (Ed)

Kevin Splichal (Ed)

Trey Hill (HBS)

Glen McNeil (HBS)

Joe Chretien (STM)

Tom Schafer (STM)

Robyn Hartman (Lib)

Helen Miles (Senate)

Adam Schibi (SGA)

Cheryl Duffy (Goss Engl)

Tanya Smith (Grad Sch)

---

3:32 (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Hartman and Heronemus. Drabkin served as proxy for Hartman, and Marez served as proxy for Heronemus. Determined that a quorum was met.

3:33 (38 minutes) Chair informed the committee that deans have already been contacted about appointing faculty members to serve on rubric development panels for the outcomes that will be fulfilled through single courses (computer information systems, college algebra, critical thinking, personal wellness, and personal finance). Discussion turned to which deans should be asked to appoint faculty members to serve on rubric panels for the remaining outcomes. It was decided that these panels should be filled as much as possible with content experts. But before settling this, discussion turned to how we could possibly expect these rubrics to be developed and approved in time to send them off for discussion at the April faculty senate meeting. Chretien asked if the process of developing rubrics, reviewing them, refining them, etc. could somehow be streamlined. There was no consensus on how to do this and not risk messing up something important.

4:08 (3 minutes) The committee decided, by unanimous vote, to set, at our next meeting, a revised timeline for what seems to us, from our current perspective, the most effective way to develop rubrics and approve courses, and then to send this on to Tim Crowley, vice provost for academic affairs. It seemed to the committee that we may need to ask for more time, that we may not be able to achieve the Fall 2020 launch date (painful though this may be for departments aching for a smaller more flexible program).

4:11 (10 minutes) Returning to setting up faculty rubric panels, the committee decided to ask the dean of AHSS to appoint panels for 2.1-A,B,E (aesthetic, historical, and philosophical modes of inquiry), to ask the dean of STM to appoint panels for 2.1-C,D (mathematical and natural scientific modes of inquiry), and to ask the deans of all five colleges to appoint one person per college to the panels for 1.4 (information literacy), 1.5 outcome 3 (critical thinking in the major), 2.1-F (social scientific mode of inquiry), 3.2 (intercultural competence), and 3.3 (engaged global citizens). The dean of the library will also be asked to appoint a person to the 1.4 panel.

4:21 (7 minutes) The committee approved the proposals for two sections of IDS 333: Exploration in the Humanities to be offered as one hour courses later this semester. One is titled "Humor Across Three Cultures," and the other is titled "Three Famous Painters through Film." The committee approved the offering of these sections, but requested that the reference to "eight (8) compositions, one for each film" in the grading section of the "Humor Across Three Cultures" syllabus be corrected, as the course involves the study of only three films.

4:28 (33 minutes) The next item for consideration was the rubric currently being used in COMM 100: Fundamentals of Oral Communication. The one-page general rubric for this course appeared to the committee at first glance to be lacking in appropriate specificity, but when the point system was examined with the accompanying four pages of explanation, it appeared, if anything, to be just the opposite, overly specific, not the sort of thing we would want to have to replicate for the entire CORE program. The thing is, *this is what the department of communication studies actually uses* when they teach the course. This led to a wide ranging discussion, hard to summarize, about what a good rubric is. At some point in the conversation, Broman wondered if it wouldn't be a good idea, *not* to have a single rubric for each set of outcomes in the CORE program. What if departments interested in offering a course to meet the outcomes for a given objective were to come up with a rubric of their own, still with the four-column "not proficient," "developing proficiency," "proficient," "exceeding proficiency" organization, but tailored to their own specific interpretation of the outcomes and their own course assignments. The idea would be for the department to submit a course proposal with this tailor-made rubric to a panel of faculty members well-qualified to judge what our outcomes mean, or should mean, and this panel would then judge whether the proposed course-and-rubric package interprets the outcomes appropriately and would be good for inclusion in the program. This suggestion seemed to several members of the committee a breakthrough idea, and perhaps a way to reasonably streamline the rubric-development-and-course-approval procedure. In principle, it would enable starting the process of course approval this semester. Chair will try to speak with Sangki Min, assistant vice president for institutional effectiveness and quality improvement, as to the advisability of this move before next week's meeting. Note: if the committee chooses to go this route, this will directly impact next week's timeline planning (see 4:08 above), as well as the planning for the rubric workshops scheduled for three weeks from now.

5:01 Meeting ended. The next meeting is Thursday February 7 in the Smoky Hill Room.

---

**Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary**

