FHSU General Education Committee

Minutes

3:32   (1 minute) All members were present with the exception of Broman, Chretien, Heronemus, McNeil, and Schibi. Duffy served as proxy for Broman, Harman served as proxy for Heronemus, and Miles served as proxy for McNeil. Determined that a quorum was met. (Chretien joined the meeting at 4:04.)

3:33   (59 minutes) The committee returned to the policy question of what restictions, if any, we were going to put on departments offering courses in different parts of the CORE program. On the one hand, we want to encourage departments not to think that they are bound to offer courses only for one or two outcome sets; on the other hand, we want to encourage students to study widely across the university, and not find themselves making their way through college, as Schafer put it, in their "own little boxes." After thinking through three alternative proposals, the committee decided, by a vote of 13 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstaining, to go with a relatively unrestictive option:

A department is limited to offering courses that satisfy the outcome sets of no more than two modes of inquiry.

This restricts what departments can propose for goal two, but lifts restrictions on what departments can propose for objectives 3.2 intercultural competence and 3.3 engaged global citizens.

4:31   (9 minutes) Splichal asked the committee to consider what would happen if, for instance, a non-science department were to propose a course that satisfies the outcomes for the natural scientific mode of inquiry. Would we accept this course into the CORE program? Would we consider only the proposed assignments and rubric in making our

decision, or would we take into account the extent to which the course as a whole, and the disciplinary expertise of the faculty members in the department, are tied to the outcomes? In considering this, it was pointed out that the course application would be studied by a faculty review panel before it came to the general education committee, so that, were the course's ability to handle the outcome set questionable, there's reason to expect this would be noticed.

4:40   (23 minutes) Attention turned next to a draft of the CORE course approval policies and procedures. It was agreed that the wording of one of the general policies (the fourth bullet point) be changed to allow outcomes 1.1A-3 and 1.5.3 to be satisfied by "an upper division course," ideally at the senior level in the student's major. In general, the group liked the draft, but Time being what it is, relentless, further consideration of the document was tabled until next week. The updated draft is appended below.

5:03   Meeting ended. The next meeting is Thursday March 7 in the Smoky Hill Room.

Submitted by D. Drabkin, Recording Secretary

Appendix:

Draft of the
COURSE APPROVAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES
FOR THE FHSU CORE PROGRAM
3/1/19

DEFINITIONS:

- COMMON LEARNING OUTCOMES: a term used by the Higher Learning Commission, FHSU's accrediting body, to identify the measurable general-education achievements attained by graduates of an institution
- OBJECTIVE: a mid-level category for organizing common learning outcomes
- GOAL: a high-level category for organizing objectives
- OUTCOME SET: a group of common learning outcomes organized under an objective, typically fulfilled by a specific course.
- SATISFYING REQUIREMENTS: a student's successful completion of a course designated as fulfilling an outcome set, earning credit for having satisfied the respective FHSU CORE requirement
- RUBRIC: a document identifying the standards for proficiency used in assessing the level of student achievement of particular outcomes
- MODE OF INQUIRY COURSE: a FHSU CORE course that fulfills the outcome-set for one of the six Modes of Inquiry identified under objective 2.1
- GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE: the Provost's committee that oversees FHSU general-education programs and makes recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee

GENERAL POLICIES:

- Candidates for bachelor's degrees are required to fulfill all FHSU CORE common learning outcomes, unless they qualify for the Transfer and Articulation General Education Program, the Bachelor of General Studies General Education Program, or the International Partnerships General Education Program.
- FHSU CORE common learning outcomes are fulfilled by successful completion of approved courses.
- Outcomes for Objective 1.4, Information Literacy, are to be fulfilled by a sophomore or junior level course—ideally, but not necessarily, from the student's major program of study.
- Outcomes 1.1-A.2 (discipline-specific writing) and 1.5.3 (discipline-specific criticism of the student's own reasoning) are to be fulfilled by an upper-division course—ideally, but not necessarily, at the senior level from the student's major program of study.

POLICIES FOR COURSE APPROVAL:

- Proposals for courses satisfying a requirement of the FHSU CORE must include the specific assignment used to measure student achievement of each learning outcome associated with the CORE outcome set the course will fulfill. Proposals must also include the rubric used to assess student achievement on each applicable CORE outcome.
- Some outcome sets serve as the basis for the content of a course, such that were two or more courses to fulfill one of those outcome sets, those courses would effectively duplicate one another. Since the University does not allow duplicate courses, the following outcome sets are each to be satisfied by only the specific designated course:

  Outcome 1.1-A 1: ENG 101 English Composition I and ENG 102 English Composition II
  Outcomes 1.1-B: COMM 100 Fundamentals of Oral Communication
  Outcomes 1.3: INF 101 Introduction to Computer Information Systems
  Outcomes 1.5 1–2: PHIL 100 Critical Thinking
  Outcomes 3.1-A: HHP 200 Personal Wellness
  Outcomes 3.1-B: FIN 205 Theory and Practice of Personal Finance

  No other course proposals will be considered for these outcomes.
- A department is limited to offering courses that satisfy outcomes sets from no more than 2 Modes of Inquiry.
- A course can fulfill more than one outcome set. However, no course will be certified to fulfill the outcome sets for more than one Mode of Inquiry.
- Courses that satisfy requirements for the CORE Program can also satisfy degree-program requirements.
- Proposals for courses fulfilling outcome sets under Objective 2.1 Modes of Inquiry, Objective 3.2 Intercultural Competence, and Objective 3.3 Engaged Global Citizens will be reviewed by Faculty Review Panels made up of no fewer than three faculty members appointed by and reporting to the General Education Committee. These panels will advise faculty on the development of assignments and rubrics, judge whether proposed assignments demonstrate students' fulfillment of outcomes, and make recommendations to the General Education Committee regarding CORE course proposals.

PROCEDURE FOR COURSE APPROVAL:

- When a department seeks approval for a course to fulfill a CORE outcome set, the department initiates the course proposal, either as a Significant Course Change or as a New Course. The proposal must include the assignments and rubric described in the Policies for Course Approval.
- The Director of General Education will direct the proposal to the appropriate Faculty Review Panel.
- The Faculty Review Panel will generate a review letter.
- The General Education Committee will generate a review letter recommending whether the Faculty Senate Academic Affairs Committee should approve the course for satisfying a CORE requirement.
- A department can revise its proposal for reconsideration by the General Education Committee.